Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
MAR 20 2007
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No. 06-1282

In The
Supreme Court of the United States

EDDIE TYRONE CRANFORD,
HOWARD MELECH, and DIANE G. MELECH,

Petitioners,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent.

On Petition For Writ Of Certiorari To The United States Court Of Appeals For The Eleventh Circuit

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

DAVID G. WIRTES, JR.
Counsel of Record
JOHN T. CROWDER, JR.
GREGORY B. BREEDLOVE
RICHARD EDWIN LAMBERTH
GEORGE M. DENT, III
CUNNINGHAM, BOUNDS, CROWDER, BROWN AND BREEDLOVE, L.L.C.
1601 Dauphin Street
P. O. Box 66705
Mobile, Alabama 36660
(251) 471-6191
(251) 479-1031 (Facsimile)

Counsel for Petitioners

COCKLE LAW BRIEF PRINTING CO. (800) 225-6964
OR CALL COLLECT (402) 342-2831

STATEMENT OF THE QUESTION PRESENTED

The Eleventh Circuit's construction of the "discretionary function" exception to federal admiralty and tort liability has become so broad that any conduct involving choice by a government agent is immune from suit, and the discretionary function exception thus swallows the rule that Congress has waived sovereign immunity. Thus, the question presented is:

Does *United States v. Gaubert*, 499 U.S. 315 (1991), lend itself correctly to the construction placed on it by the Eleventh Circuit in this and other cases, in conflict with the construction placed on *Gaubert* by other Courts of Appeals, which hold that decisions based on such factors as "technical safety assessments," "objective criteria," or "professional, scientific, or engineering standards," are not within the scope of the discretionary function exception, because they are not "based on considerations of public policy"? *Id.* at 323 (quoting *Berkovitz v. United States*, 486 U.S. 531, 537 (1991)).

PARTIES

The Plaintiffs are Diane G. Melech, as Personal Representative and Administratrix of the Estate of Ronald C. Melech, deceased; Howard Melech; and Eddie Tyrone Cranford. The Defendant is the United States of America, based on actions taken by the United States Coast Guard. No corporate disclosure statement is pertinent.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
STATEMENT OF THE QUESTION PRESENTED.....	i
PARTIES	ii
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	iv
CITATIONS TO THE OFFICIAL AND UNOFFICIAL REPORTS.....	1
THE BASIS FOR JURISDICTION IN THIS COURT.....	1
STATUTES INVOLVED IN THE CASE	1
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	3
REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE OF THE WRIT	8
1. The Two-Prong Test of *United States v. Gaubert*	9
2. The Eleventh Circuit's Evisceration of the Second Prong of the *Gaubert* Test.....	11
3. Other Circuits Have Properly Followed *Gaubert*	16
CONCLUSION.....	30

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

CASES

Andrews v. United States, 121 F.3d 1430 (11th Cir. 1997) 11

Andrulonis v. United States, 952 F.2d 652 (2d Cir. 1991) 16, 17, 18

ARA Leisure Serv. v. United States, 831 F.2d 193 (9th Cir. 1987) 19

Aslakson v. United States, 790 F.2d 688 (8th Cir. 1986) 19

Autery v. United States, 992 F.2d 1523 (11th Cir. 1993) 12

Ayala v. United States, 980 F.2d 1342 (10th Cir. 1992) 18, 25, 26

Bear Medicine v. United States ex rel. Sec'y of the Dep't of the Interior, 241 F.3d 1208 (9th Cir. 2001) 13, 24, 25

Berkovitz v. United States, 486 U.S. 531 (1991) ..... *passim*

Cestonaro v. United States, 211 F.3d 749 (3d Cir. 2000) 16, 20, 21

Cohen v. United States, 151 F.3d 1338 (11th Cir. 1998) 11

Cope v. Scott, 45 F.3d 445 (D.C. Cir. 1995) ..... *passim*

Dolan v. United States Postal Service, 546 U.S. 481, 126 S.Ct. 1252 (2006) 28, 29

Drake Towing Co. v. Meisner Marine Constr. Co., 765 F.2d 1060 (11th Cir. 1985) 15

Eklof Marine Corp. v. United States, 762 F.2d 200 (2d Cir. 1985) 23

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

Page

Enlow v. United States, 161 Fed. Appx. 837 (11th Cir. 2006) 12

Gotha v. United States, 115 F.3d 176 (3rd Cir. 1997) 21

Hughes v. United States, 110 F.3d 765 (11th Cir. 1997) 12

Hurd v. United States, 134 F.Supp.2d 745 (D.S.C. 2001), *aff'd*, 34 Fed. Appx. 77 (4th Cir. 2002) 16, 22

Indian Towing Company v. United States, 350 U.S. 61 (1955) .....*passim*

Kennewick Irrigation Dist. v. United States, 880 F.2d 1018 (9th Cir. 1989) 19

Kosak v. United States, 465 U.S. 848 (1984) 29

Lane v. Peña, 518 U.S. 187 (1996) 29

Lawson v. United States, 124 F.3d 198 (6th Cir. 1997) (table) (reported at 1997 WL 530540) 23, 24

Marbulk Shipping, Inc. v. Martin-Marietta Materials, Inc., 271 F.Supp.2d 1374 (S.D. Ala. 2003) 12

Martinez v. United States, 192 Fed. Appx. 839 (11th Cir. 2006) 12, 13

McMellon v. United States, 387 F.3d 329 (4th Cir. 2004), *cert. den.*, 544 U.S. 974 (2005) 22

Mesa v. United States, 123 F.3d 1435 (11th Cir. 1997) 11

Mid-South Holding Co. v. United States, 225 F.3d 1201 (11th Cir. 2000) 11

Miles v. Naval Aviation Museum Foundation, 289 F.3d 715 (11th Cir. 2002) 12

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

Page

Monzon v. United States, 253 F.3d 567 (11th Cir. 2001) 11

Myers v. United States, 17 F.3d 890 (6th Cir. 1994) ... 16, 22, 23

O'Toole v. United States, 295 F.3d 1029 (9th Cir. 2002) 24

Ochran v. United States, 117 F.3d 495 (11th Cir. 1997) 12

OSI, Inc. v. United States, 285 F.3d 947 (11th Cir. 2002) 11

Powers v. United States, 996 F.2d 1121 (11th Cir. 1993) 12

Shansky v. United States, 164 F.3d 688 (1st Cir. 1999) 16, 18, 20

Somerset Seafood Co. v. United States, 193 F.2d 631 (4th Cir. 1951) 23

Summers v. United States, 905 F.2d 1212 (9th Cir. 1990) 19

U. S. Fire Ins. Co. v. United States, 806 F.2d 1529 (11th Cir. 1986) 15

United States v. Gaubert, 499 U.S. 315 (1991) ..... *passim*

United States v. Olson, 546 U.S. 43, 126 S.Ct. 510 (2005) 15

Whisnant v. United States, 400 F.3d 1177 (9th Cir. 2005) 16, 24, 25

STATUTES

28 U.S.C. § 1254(1) 1

28 U.S.C. § 1333 8

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

Page

28 U.S.C. § 1346 8

28 U.S.C. § 2680 (Federal Tort Claims Act) ..... *passim*

33 U.S.C. § 409 (Wreck Act) 29

46 U.S.C. app. § 742 (Suits in Admiralty Act) ..... *passim*

46 U.S.C. app. § 781 (Public Vessels Act) ..... *passim*

OTHER AUTHORITIES

Aids to Navigation Manual ("ATON") 5

CITATIONS TO THE OFFICIAL AND UNOFFICIAL REPORTS

The opinion under review is *Cranford v. United States*, No. 06-10685, October 5, 2006, 466 F.3d 955 (11th Cir. 2006). The underlying December 13, 2005, opinion and order of the District Court for the Southern District of Alabama is styled *Rebecca Nelson v. United States of America*, Civil Action No. 04-560-CB-M (a complaint based on a separate allision with the same submerged wreck, not at issue here); *Eddie Tyrone Cranford v. United States of America*, Civil Action No. 04-561-CB-M; *Howard Melech v. United States of America*, Civil Action No. 04-562-CB-M; *Diane G. Melech, et al. v. United States of America*, Civil Action No. 04-563-CB-M. The District Court did not designate its opinion for publication.

THE BASIS FOR JURISDICTION IN THIS COURT

The Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit entered its judgment on October 5, 2006. App. 1. The Court of Appeals denied petitions for rehearing and for rehearing *en banc* on December 21, 2006. App. 28-29. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1) to review the judgment of the Court of Appeals pursuant to a petition for writ of certiorari.

STATUTES INVOLVED IN THE CASE

This action proceeds principally under the Suits in Admiralty Act ("SAA"):

> In cases where ... if a private person or property were involved, a proceeding in admiralty could be maintained, any appropriate nonjury proceeding in personam may be brought against the United States.

46 U.S.C. app. § 742. This action also proceeds under the Public Vessels Act ("PVA"):

> A libel in personam in admiralty may be brought against the United States ... for damages caused by a public vessel of the United States.

46 U.S.C. app. § 781. The Eleventh Circuit followed its previous holdings that both of these Congressional waivers of sovereign immunity in admiralty cases against the United States "are subject to the discretionary function exception of the Federal Tort Claims Act (FTCA)." App. 5. The discretionary function exception of the Federal Tort Claims Act provides:

> The provisions of this chapter ... shall not apply to –
>
> (a) Any claim based upon an act or omission of an employee of the Government ... based upon the exercise or performance or the failure to exercise or perform a discretionary function or duty on the part of a federal agency or an employee of the Government, whether or not the discretion involved be abused.

28 U.S.C. § 2680(a).

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The evidence in this case highlights the Eleventh Circuit's misinterpretation of *Gaubert* and its conflict with the holdings of other circuits. This is because the evidence establishes, beyond any doubt, that the government's decisions in this case that led to the death of Ronnie Melech and the injuries to his brother, Howard Melech, and friend, Tyrone Cranford, had absolutely nothing to do with social, political, or economic policy. Instead, the evidence demonstrates a complete failure of professional assessment, a failure to follow objective criteria, and a reckless disregard for the safety of our fellow citizens in the face of obvious safety considerations, which in other Circuits do not fall within the scope of the discretionary function exception. Those facts are as follows:

As the District Court found, the wreck that the Plaintiffs struck was likely a government-owned vessel that the government intentionally sank near the mouth of Mobile Bay over 50 years ago. App. 18. The government was aware of the severity of the hazard and of numerous accidents caused by the wreck. Doc. 30, Exs. 1, 3-9, 17. More than eight years before the Plaintiffs' allision with the submerged wreck, one Coast Guard employee, who had made several requests to his superiors for assistance to have the wreck better marked or removed, wrote the following in one of his requests:

> [N]o one can offer a real solution or compromise. Since I've done all I know to do about this case, I really don't want to talk with the lawyers when they come here with their inquiries. ***When someone gets killed hitting this thing***, then we'll have some questions to answer.

Doc. 30, Ex. 1, p. 2 (emphasis added).

Despite the government's knowledge of the severity of the hazard, the Coast Guard failed to adequately mark the wreck. Initially, the Coast Guard set a single temporary lighted buoy to mark the wreck, which the Coast Guard found unreliable because it often drifted away from the wreck, during which time several boaters hit the wreck. Doc. 30, Ex. 3, pp. 11-12, 13; Ex. 1, p. 1. Later, the Coast Guard placed a permanent white and orange marker with the words "Danger Wreck" in the vicinity of the wreck. Doc. 30, Ex. 3, p. 16. However, that marker was at least 200 feet due north of the wreck. Doc. 30, Ex. 1, p. 15; Doc. 30, Ex. 3, p. 2. In fact, the Coast Guard's own employees believed the marker was too far from the wreck, not properly marking the wreck, and that the "hazard [was] marked poorly." Doc. 30, Ex. 1, pp. 4, 15; Doc. 30, Ex. 3, p. 2.

In 2003, after yet another accident at the wreck, the Coast Guard decided to change the "Danger Wreck" marker. Coast Guard employees familiar with the site and the waters of Mobile Bay (some of whom were stationed in Mobile) recommended that the Coast Guard use markers that clearly stated that a danger was in the area (such as an "isolated danger marker" or the "Danger Wreck" markers), that the marker be moved closer to the wreck, and that the marker be lighted. Doc. 30, Ex. 1, p. 13. However, the decision-maker in New Orleans, who had never been to the area, decided not to move the marker closer to the wreck. He also decided to replace the "Danger Wreck" marker with a red triangular marker, which looks exactly like a channel marker, and which draws recreational boaters toward the wreck. Doc. 30, Ex. 1, p. 13; Ex. 17, pp. 8-9.

In making these decisions, these Coast Guard employees did not consider social, economic, or political policy. The local Coast Guard employees were merely concerned

with providing the best warning possible under the circumstances. As evidenced by their correspondence with their superior, these employees requested that the Coast Guard use an "isolated danger" marker or a "Danger Wreck" marker which would clearly give the public adequate notice and which would provide safe passage around the wreck. Unfortunately, their superior, Anthony Marinelli, rejected these common sense ideas and decided to use a single confusing red channel marker to mark the wreck. The reasoning for his rejection, was, in his words, the following: "I've learned *to cover my butt*. The next time Joe-Boater hits this wreck, I want to be able to tell the judge that the aid [marking the wreck] conforms to COMDT standards, *whether or not it meets our approval.*" Doc. 30, Ex. 1, p. 3 (emphasis added).

The "COMDT standards" to which Mr. Marinelli referred are contained in an obscure and unpublished (to the public) *internal* Coast Guard manual known as the Aids to Navigation ("ATON") Manual. As the Eleventh Circuit held, this ATON Manual did not require the marker that Mr. Marinelli decided to use. App. 8. In fact, the ATON Manual's own language demonstrates that in deciding how to mark a wreck, Coast Guard employees are not to apply any fixed or rigid standard. Doc. 30, Ex. 18, p. 2, § 1.A.3. Instead, the ATON Manual requires basic safety decisions about whether wreck markings are "near the wreck," whether they are placed to minimize "possible confusion," and whether they ensure that a boater can pass the wreck safely. Doc. 30, Ex. 18, p. 7, § 6.A.2.f. To carry out these decisions, the ATON Manual requires that Coast Guard employees exercise "more than the minimum threshold of due care." *Id.*, p. 2, § 1.A.3.

These statements in the ATON Manual are consistent with the statement of Plaintiffs' expert, Captain Alvin Cattalini, a former Coast Guard Captain and Chief of Navigation Safety in Washington, D.C. Captain Cattalini opined that the government's marking was inconsistent with its own internal guidelines, which required that the Coast Guard make decisions based, not on social, political, or economic policy, but upon common sense safety principles, such as whether the marker was confusing to recreational boaters, whether it was close enough to the wreck, and whether it was sufficient to ensure safe passage by recreational boaters. Doc. 30, Ex. 17, pp. 8-9.[1]

Despite the fact that the ATON Manual required the consideration of such factors, which require merely technical, objective, and professional assessments about the adequacy of a warning, the Coast Guard failed to consider these factors. It ignored the fact that the marker was confusing, in that even the Coast Guard's own employees could not determine which side to safely pass the wreck. Doc. 30, Ex. 9, p. 45; Ex. 12, pp. 51-52, 68-69, 96-97. It ignored the fact that the marker was not close enough to the wreck. It also ignored the fact that the chosen marker actually drew boaters to the wreck, thereby making a bad situation worse. Doc. 30, Ex. 17, pp. 8-9. Instead, the Coast Guard proceeded to replace the "Danger Wreck" marker with a single red channel marker, of which its own employees did not approve.

---

[1] Captain Cattalini also stated that the Coast Guard's conduct was "unconscionable" and that the decision to use a confusing channel marker to mark the wreck made a "bad situation worse." Doc. 30, Ex. 17, p. 9. The Eleventh Circuit ignored this evidence.

The marker was so poorly done that Coast Guard employees who recorded the Meleches' accident determined that the wreck was "unmarked." *See* Ex. 7 to Doc. 30, which is a document produced from the Coast Guard's Boating Accident Report Database stating that "vessel #1 was in route to the boat ramp when the vessel struck a currently ***unmarked*** sunken barge." (Emphasis added). Similarly, the Alabama Marine Police, which investigated the accident, determined that the cause of the accident was "***unmarked*** obstruction." Doc. 30, Ex. 15, pp. 8-9 (emphasis added).

It is no wonder, then, that just four days after (and on the first Saturday after) the Coast Guard removed the "Danger Wreck" sign and replaced it with the confusing channel marker, two boats and one JetSki hit the wreck. As demonstrated herein, the government introduced ***no*** evidence that these allisions resulted from a decision based on social, political, or economic policy. Instead, the overwhelming evidence is that the agency's employees simply failed to act with due care consistent with objective safety standards and consistent with professional and technical judgments. Further, when the agency settled upon the inadequate and misplaced red triangle, it was selected to "cover [their] butt[s] [from] the judge" who, the Coast Guard expected, would hear the ***next*** personal injury or death case. Doc. 30, Ex. 1, p. 3. Thus, it is clear that the method of marking the wreck was not based on social, economic, or political policy, but, at best, on objective principles of safety, and at worst, on the desire of the Coast Guard employees to "cover [their] butt[s] [from] the judge."

Diane Melech, as the widow of Ronnie Melech; Howard Melech; and Tyrone Cranford filed complaints in the Southern District of Alabama on August 25, 2004. Doc. 1.

The District Court had jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1333 and 1346. On June 7, 2005, the United States moved, on the basis of the discretionary function exception to the waiver of sovereign immunity, to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction or, alternatively, for summary judgment. Doc. 23. Plaintiffs filed a response, Doc. 30, and the United States filed a reply, Doc. 32.

On December 13, 2005, the District Court entered an order granting the motions to dismiss. App. 13-27. After the Plaintiffs appealed, the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit affirmed the judgment of dismissal. App. 1-12. Plaintiffs filed a petition for rehearing *en banc*, but the Court denied that petition on December 21, 2006. App. 28-29.

REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE OF THE WRIT

The Eleventh Circuit's opinion in this case, if allowed to stand, would eliminate the remedy provided by Congress to victims of federal torts in any case in which the federal employee has a choice. This is because the Eleventh Circuit has, in stark contrast to other Courts of Appeals, interpreted the discretionary function exception to immunize all conduct that does not amount to negligence per se.

The Eleventh Circuit's opinion in this case conflicts with a body of law on the subject developed by other circuit courts of appeal. In analyzing whether a choice made by a federal agent was an immune "discretionary function" or not, the other courts of appeals have considered whether the decision in question "involve[d] technical safety assessments," "objective professional judgments," the application of "objective scientific standards," "observation[s] informed

by professional judgment and knowledge," "objective criteria," "matters of scientific and professional judgment – particularly judgments concerning safety," or "engineering judgment." The analytical tools employed by the other circuit courts of appeals provide a reasoned basis upon which the congressional waiver of sovereign immunity in the FTCA, the SAA, and the PVA is given due scope. By contrast, the Eleventh Circuit, in this and all other similar cases, has dismissively rejected any and all attempts to assert that a decision by a federal agent can be anything other than grounded in public policy and therefore immune.

1. The Two-Prong Test of *United States v. Gaubert*

In *United States v. Gaubert*, 499 U.S. 315 (1991), this Court refined the test for the discretionary function exception to the FTCA:

> The exception covers only acts that are discretionary in nature, acts that "involv[e] an element of judgment or choice". . . . The requirement of judgment or choice is not satisfied if a "federal statute, regulation or policy specifically prescribes a course of action for an employee to follow," because "the employee has no rightful option but to adhere to the directive."

499 U.S. at 322 (citations omitted). This has become the "first prong" of the *Gaubert* test, under which an employee is not performing a discretionary function if he has no room to exercise "judgment or choice" in the matter.

It is the second prong of the *Gaubert* test that has confounded the Eleventh Circuit:

> Furthermore, even "assuming the challenged conduct involves an element of judgment," it

> remains to be decided "whether that judgment is of the kind that the discretionary function exception was designed to shield." . . . Because the purpose of the exception is to "prevent judicial 'second-guessing' of legislative and administrative decisions *grounded in* social, economic and political *policy* through the medium of an action in tort," . . . , when properly construed, the exception "protects only governmental *actions and decisions based on considerations of public policy.*"

Id. at 322-23 (emphasis added; citations omitted).

This Court's amplification on the second prong of the test includes some broad language that the Eleventh Circuit has consistently misconstrued as immunizing all government conduct that does not constitute negligence per se. That language includes the following: "On the other hand, if a regulation allows the employee discretion, the very existence of the regulation creates a strong presumption that a discretionary act authorized by the regulation involves consideration of the same policies which led to the promulgation of the regulations." *Id.* at 324. Further,

> When established governmental policy, as expressed or implied by statute, regulation, or agency guidelines, allows a Government agent to exercise discretion, it must be *presumed* that the agent's acts are *grounded in policy* when exercising that discretion. For a complaint to survive a motion to dismiss, it must allege facts which would support a finding that the challenged actions are not the kind of conduct that can be said to be *grounded in* the *policy* of the regulatory regime. The focus of the inquiry is not on the agent's subjective intent in exercising the discretion conferred by statute or regulation, but on

> the nature of the actions taken and on whether they are *susceptible to policy analysis*.

Id. at 324-25 (emphasis added). As demonstrated below, the Eleventh Circuit, in conflict with other circuits, has construed this explanation of the second prong of the *Gaubert* test in a manner that immunizes all government conduct involving choice.

2. The Eleventh Circuit's Evisceration of the Second Prong of the *Gaubert* Test

Since *Gaubert*, the Eleventh Circuit has held that every single government decision involving an element of choice is immune from suit. As a well respected Judge of the Southern District of Alabama, The Honorable William H. Steele, has noted: "the Eleventh Circuit has found the discretionary function exception to be applicable in almost every case it has considered since *Gaubert*," listing the following instances:

> *OSI, Inc. v. United States*, 285 F.3d [947, 953 (11th Cir. 2002)] (Air Force's landfill disposal of waste); *Monzon v. United States*, 253 F.3d 567, 572 (11th Cir. 2001) (National Weather Service's failure to warn of rip currents); *Mid-South Holding Co. v. United States*, 225 F.3d [1201, 1202 (11th Cir. 2000)] (Coast Guard's and Customs Service's boarding and search of vessel); *Cohen v. United States*, 151 F.3d [1338, 1343-44 (11th Cir. 1998)] (Bureau of Prisons' classification and placement of prisoners); *Mesa v. United States*, 123 F.3d [1435, 1438 (11th Cir. 1997)] (Drug Enforcement Agency's decision how to locate and identify the subject of an arrest warrant); *Andrews v. United States*, 121 F.3d 1430, 1440 (11th Cir. 1997) (Navy's decision to delegate waste control to a

> private concern); *Ochran v. United States*, 117 F.3d [495, 501-02 (11th Cir. 1997)] (Assistant United States Attorney's failure to protect a victim threatened by a suspected offender); *Hughes v. United States*, 110 F.3d [765, 768 (11th Cir. 1997)] (Postal Service's security measures); *Powers v. United States*, 996 F.2d [1121, 1126 (11th Cir. 1993)] (Federal Emergency Management Agency's publicizing of the availability of flood insurance); *Autery v. United States*, 992 F.2d [1523, 1531 (11th Cir. 1993)] (National Park Service's selection and execution of procedures for inspecting for hazardous trees).

Marbulk Shipping, Inc. v. Martin-Marietta Materials, Inc., 271 F.Supp.2d 1374, 1378, n. 7 (S.D. Ala. 2003). Footnote 7 of *Marbulk* continues:

> In the only known Eleventh Circuit cased [sic] rejecting the discretionary function exception since *Gaubert*, the exception foundered on the first criterion because the government actor had no discretion to begin with. See *Miles v. Naval Aviation Museum Foundation*, 289 F.3d [715, 722 (11th Cir. 2002)]; *Ochran v. United States*, 117 F.3d at 504.

Id. Plaintiffs have carried forward Judge Steele's research as reflected in *Marbulk* by searching the Westlaw database CTA11 for the word "Gaubert." The search disclosed only three additional opinions: *Cranford v. United States*, the October 5, 2006, opinion now under review; *Martinez v. United States*, 192 Fed. Appx. 839, 841 (11th Cir. 2006) (dismissal of a pro se action against the EEOC, affirmed because "The discretionary function exception clearly applies here because the alleged misconduct involved the elements of judgment and choice."); and *Enlow v. United*

States, 161 Fed. Appx. 837 (11th Cir. 2006) (affirming dismissal of an inmate's case alleging negligence in transferring him, an informant, out of a special housing unit without first reviewing his file; affirmed on the grounds that both the first and second prongs of the *Gaubert* test were met).

Further, the District Court here confirmed the Eleventh Circuit's view of *Gaubert* by stating the following: "While the plaintiffs are correct that this formulation of the discretionary function exception to the waiver of sovereign immunity threatens to swallow the waiver, this result is nonetheless called for by the controlling precedents." App. 25. In fact, the Eleventh Circuit itself has said that the discretionary function clearly applies when "the alleged misconduct involved the elements of judgment and choice." *Martinez*, 192 Fed. Appx. at 841. However, as this Court and other circuits have made clear, it is not the "elements of judgment and choice" that render the conduct immune. Instead, a court must look to "the nature of the actions taken" to determine if it falls within the discretionary function exception.[2] *Gaubert*, 499 U.S. at 325.

By refusing to look at the nature of the conduct at issue, but instead focusing on the elements of judgment and

---

[2] *Gaubert* also holds that the issue is not whether the federal employee actually considered public policy but whether the decision "was susceptible to policy analysis." 499 U.S. at 325. This holding is not a basis for declining to issue the writ. It is clear from the facts of this case that the decision *only* involved issues of public safety. Further, as the Ninth Circuit has held, the government cannot create "ex post facto rationalizations . . . in an attempt to invoke the discretionary shield." *Bear Medicine v. United States*, 241 F.3d 1208, 1211 (9th Cir. 2001). If the government could create such rationalization, it would be impossible for any victim of a federal tort to overcome the "presum[ption] that the agent's acts are grounded in policy." *Gaubert*, 499 U.S. at 324.

choice, the Eleventh Circuit has separated itself from other circuits which hold that conduct involving technical safety judgments, objective criteria, or professional engineering standards is not immune. In this case, the court rejected Plaintiffs' argument based on the cases from other circuits discussed below with the following dismissive comment, not even acknowledging the contrary line of authority:

> The contention that the Coast Guard applied professional standards "is just another way of saying that the considerations . . . are so precisely formulated that decisions at the operational level *never* involve the exercise of discretion within the meaning of [the discretionary function exception], a notion that [the Supreme Court] ha[s] . . . rejected."

App. 9, quoting *Gaubert*, 499 U.S. at 331 (alterations in *Cranford*; emphasis added). Plaintiffs do not argue that "operational level" decisions "never involve the exercise of discretion." Instead, Plaintiffs argue that judgments or choices that depend upon a factual analysis of a situation and upon such criteria as "technical safety judgments," "objective criteria," or "professional, engineering, or scientific standards," are not discretionary decisions within the meaning of the discretionary function exception.

The gravity of the situation can be seen from the fact that this case is virtually on all fours with *Indian Towing Company v. United States*, 350 U.S. 61 (1955), but the Eleventh Circuit dismissed *Indian Towing* with the comment that it is "severely undercut if not altogether disavowed," App. 7, quoting an earlier Eleventh Circuit opinion. However, contrary to *overruling Indian Towing* in *Gaubert*, this Court clarified it and left it intact. 499 U.S. at 326. The Court has also recently *reaffirmed Indian*

Towing in *United States v. Olson*, 546 U.S. 43, 126 S.Ct. 510 (2005).[3]

In *Gaubert*, this Court held that "When established governmental policy ... allows a Government agent to exercise discretion, it must be *presumed* that the agent's acts are grounded in policy when exercising that discretion." 499 U.S. at 324 (emphasis added). The Eleventh Circuit has made that presumption irrebuttable. The evidence in this case demonstrates knowledge of unsafe conditions, knowledge that the proposed modification of a safety warning would not make conditions safer, and a callous formalism that disregarded the danger of the proposed solution. Nevertheless, the Eleventh Circuit did not even consider the possibility that Plaintiffs had rebutted the presumption, but merely dismissed Plaintiffs' arguments as "just another way of saying that ... decisions at the operational level never involve the exercise of discretion within the meaning of [the discretionary function exception]." App. 9, quoting *Gaubert*, 499 U.S. at 331 (alteration by the Eleventh Circuit). The Eleventh Circuit's broad reading of the "grounded in social, economic, or political policy" language of *Gaubert* writes the second prong of the test out of existence, and allows only negligence per se, the direct violation of a specific requirement, as actionable under the FTCA, the SAA, or the PVA.

---

[3] The Eleventh Circuit held that *Gaubert* had the effect of overruling *U. S. Fire Ins. Co. v. United States*, 806 F.2d 1529 (11th Cir. 1986); and *Drake Towing Co. v. Meisner Marine Constr. Co.*, 765 F.2d 1060 (11th Cir. 1985). App. 6-7. On the contrary, those cases are still good law to the same extent that *Indian Towing*, on which they rely, is still good law.

3. Other Circuits Have Properly Followed *Gaubert*

The Eleventh Circuit has yet to find any circumstances that satisfy the second prong of the *Gaubert* test. By contrast, other circuits have developed reasonable applications of the "grounded in public policy" language in *Gaubert*.

The Plaintiffs presented a discussion of the following cases from other jurisdictions to the Eleventh Circuit, but the court dismissed the analysis in Plaintiffs' brief and in those cases as merely attempting to revive the "planning/operational" distinction discredited in *Gaubert*. App. 9. On the contrary, the following opinions carefully analyze the nature of the decision being made to determine whether policy considerations were at issue. It is the Eleventh Circuit that has improperly revitalized the "operational" concept, holding that any decision made by any federal agent in carrying out any federal activity necessarily constitutes a policy-making decision that is an immunized discretionary activity. Other circuits, while carefully refraining from adopting a blanket "safety" exclusion from the discretionary function exception, have developed tests to determine whether safety-related decisions truly involve policy-making or -executing discretion, or only involve the application of "objective criteria," "technical safety assessments," or "scientific, professional, or engineering standards." *See Shansky v. United States*, 164 F.3d 688, 693-94 (1st Cir. 1999); *Andrulonis v. United States*, 952 F.2d 652, 654-55 (2d Cir. 1991); *Cestonaro v. United States*, 211 F.3d 749, 757-59 (3d Cir. 2000); *Hurd v. United States*, 134 F.Supp.2d 745, 768-69 (D.S.C. 2001), *aff'd*, 34 Fed. Appx. 77 (4th Cir. 2002); *Myers v. United States*, 17 F.3d 890, 897-98 (6th Cir. 1994); *Whisnant v.*

United States, 400 F.3d 1177, 1181-82 (9th Cir. 2005); and *Cope v. Scott*, 45 F.3d 445, 448-52 (D.C. Cir. 1995).[4]

Perhaps the earliest example comes from the Second Circuit in *Andrulonis v. United States*, 952 F.2d 652 (2nd Cir. 1991). There, after its original decision was vacated and the cause remanded pursuant to *Gaubert*, the Second Circuit reaffirmed its holding that the alleged failure of a federal official to warn of hazards associated with the use of a rabies vaccine did not constitute a discretionary function. In discussing *Gaubert*, the Second Circuit noted that "*Gaubert*'s import lies in its clarification of *Indian Towing* and its rejection of any simplistic reliance on the dichotomy between planning-level actions and operational-level actions. Policy considerations, however, remain the touchstone for determining whether the discretionary function exception applies." *Id.* at 654. The Court concluded:

> Nothing indicates that CDC policy required, or even encouraged, Dr. Baer to ignore unsafe laboratory conditions and thereby unnecessarily place the lives of laboratory workers at risk in order to further a scientific cause or any other objective of the government. The general policy of wanting to eradicate rabies and granting officials some discretion to achieve those ends is far too broad and indefinite to insulate Dr. Baer's negligent conduct in the circumstances of this case. Thus, Dr. Baer's action "cannot be said to be based on the purposes the regulatory regime seeks to accomplish."

---

[4] Plaintiffs have found no cases considering this type of analysis – either applying it or refusing to do so – from the Fifth, Seventh, or Eighth Circuit Courts of Appeals.

Id. at 655. Similarly, no Coast Guard policy requires, or even encourages, its officers to ignore unsafe maritime conditions and thereby unnecessarily place the lives of mariners at risk simply to further a bureaucrat's desire to "cover [his] butt." Doc. 30, Ex. 1, p. 2.

The First Circuit, in *Shansky v. United States*, 164 F.3d 688 (1st Cir. 1999), approved the District of Columbia Circuit's highly workable construction as to whether safety-promoting activities of the government fall within the second prong of the *Gaubert* test, i.e., whether the decision in question "involve[d] technical safety assessments." 164 F.3d at 694, citing *Cope v. Scott*, 45 F.3d 445 (D.C. Cir. 1995). Although the *Shansky* court held that the Park Service's balancing of "incommensurable values such as safety and aesthetics" would not be "rework[ed] by the judicial branch," 164 F.3d at 693, it emphasized that the policy-making decisions involved weighing aesthetics at a historic site that did not have safety rails versus the decision whether to add such modern safety measures, *not* a weighing of how safety was to be effectuated. The discussion in *Shansky* includes the following pertinent paragraph and footnote:

> This holding falls neatly into a line of cases involving plaintiffs who challenge official judgments that implicate *technical safety assessments* conducted pursuant to prior policy choices. *See, e.g., Ayala v. United States*, 980 F.2d 1342, 1348-49 (10th Cir. 1992); *Andrulonis v. United States*, 952 F.2d 652, 655 (2d Cir. 1991). Such decisions come within a category of *objective professional judgments* that, without more, are not readily amenable to policy analysis. *See Berkovitz*, 486 U.S. at 545, 108 S.Ct. 1954 (indicating that discretion involving application of "*objective scientific*

standards" is not policy-based discretion); *Kennewick Irrigation Dist. v. United States*, 880 F.2d 1018, 1030 (9th Cir. 1989) (similar). Thus, to determine whether an action taken in such circumstances is grounded in policy-based discretion, the operative *distinction is* the one *between a judgment that embodies a professional assessment* undertaken *pursuant to* a policy of *settled priorities and a fully discretionary judgment that balances incommensurable values in order to establish those priorities.*[FN5]

[FN5] This distinction clearly underpins the analysis in cases such as *Summers v. United States*, 905 F.2d 1212 (9th Cir. 1990), and *ARA Leisure Serv. v. United States*, 831 F.2d 193 (9th Cir. 1987). The distinction is perhaps illustrated most effectively by contrasting *ARA Leisure*'s separate holdings. The court concluded that the Park Service's initial decision to design and construct a park road without guardrails was protected by the discretionary function exception (principally on the ground that Park Service policies required roads to be "esthetically pleasing"), yet held that failure to maintain a certain stretch of the road in a safe condition was not grounded in policy (and, therefore, not protected). *See id.* at 195. In a particularly revealing passage, the court explained that "*where the challenged governmental activity involves safety considerations under an established policy rather than the balancing of competing policy considerations, the rationale for the exception falls away and the United States will be responsible for the negligence of its employees.*" *Id.* (quoting *Aslakson v. United States*, 790 F.2d 688, 693 (8th Cir. 1986)). The District of Columbia Circuit drew essentially the same distinction in upholding Cope's "failure

> to warn" claim, but foreclosing his "failure to make the road surface skid-resistant" claim. *See Cope*, 45 F.3d at 450-51.

Shansky, 164 F.3d at 693 (emphasis added).

The Third Circuit has held that, although the government retained discretion with respect to lighting and warning decisions, the decisions were *not grounded in policy objectives* and so were not immune under the second prong of *Gaubert*. *Cestonaro v. United States*, 211 F.3d 749 (3d Cir. 2000). "The National Park Service fails to show how providing some lighting, but not more, is grounded in the policy objectives with respect to the management of the National Historic Site." *Id.* at 757. The *Cestonaro* court distinguished *Shansky*, *supra*, noting that *Shansky* recognized that "there must be a 'plausible nexus between the challenged conduct and the asserted justification.'" 211 F.3d at 757, n. 6 (quoting 164 F.3d at 695). The Third Circuit was "unable to find a rational nexus between the National Park Service's lighting or warning decisions (or non-decisions) and social, economic and political concerns." *Id.* at 759. The court held that "The National Park Service remains free to make decisions grounded in policy considerations without risking tort liability; but it cannot make decisions unrelated to policy and then seek shelter under the discretionary function exception." *Id.* Like other circuits outside the Eleventh Circuit, the Third Circuit treats *Indian Towing* as being still good law:

> In one of its early treatments of the FTCA, the Supreme Court articulated the Act's purpose in terms that underscore why the National Park Service cannot rely on the discretionary function exception here. The Court stated:

> The broad and just purpose which the statute was designed to effect was to compensate the victims of negligence in the conduct of governmental affairs in circumstances like unto those in which a private person would be liable and not to leave just treatment to the caprice and legislative burden of individual private laws.

Cestonaro, 211 F.3d at 759 (quoting *Indian Towing*, 350 U.S. at 68-69).

Another Third Circuit opinion applying the second prong of the *Gaubert* test is *Gotha v. United States*, 115 F.3d 176 (3rd Cir. 1997). The question there was whether the Navy was entitled to immunity for a decision not to provide a stairway, railing, and lighting to make a steep pathway on a Navy facility safe. The court held that "the action or inaction goes more to the issue of negligence rather than whether the issue of policy discretion is implicated." *Id.* at 180. Rejecting an argument by the Navy that "there are military, social and economic considerations involved," the court held that "the Navy's proffered reasons are of such general application as to provide no assistance in determining whether the discretionary function exception fits the situation here." *Id.* at 181.

> This case is not about a national security concern, but rather a mundane, administrative, garden-variety housekeeping problem that is about as far removed from the policies applicable to the Navy's mission as it is possible to get. In the words of the Supreme Court, the "challenged actions are not the kind of conduct that can be said to be grounded in the policy of the regulatory regime."

Id. at 181-82 (citation omitted).

It was only in 2004 that the Fourth Circuit held that a discretionary function exception must be read into the Suits in Admiralty Act and the Private Vessels Act. *McMellon v. United States*, 387 F.3d 329 (4th Cir. 2004), *cert. den.*, 544 U.S. 974 (2005). However, in *Hurd v. United States*, 134 F.Supp.2d 745 (D.S.C. 2001), *aff'd*, 34 Fed. Appx. 77 (4th Cir. 2002), the District Court for the District of South Carolina "assum[ed] that the Fourth Circuit would imply a discretionary function exception to Defendants' waiver of sovereign immunity under the SIAA," and held that such a discretionary function exception "would not apply to the facts of this case because this court has found that the Coast Guard exercised its discretion by making the policy decision to render aid in the search and rescue operation, and concomitantly was *obligated to exercise reasonable care in the operation*." 134 F.Supp. at 768 (emphasis added). The court held that once the Coast Guard officer "made the decision to render aid, [his] decisions were not grounded in social, economic, or political policy. Rather, he merely implemented, under *objective criteria*, the clear mandates of the Coast Guard." *Id.* at 769 (emphasis added). Thus, *Hurd*, having been affirmed by the Fourth Circuit, stands as authority for the proposition that the Fourth Circuit would not apply a discretionary function exception to safety-related activity, once undertaken by the government, if the decisions on how to conduct that safety-related activity are based on "objective criteria."

In *Myers v. United States*, 17 F.3d 890 (6th Cir. 1994), the Sixth Circuit held that "the choices inherent in these [mine safety] assessments are to be made by MSHA inspectors in light of their own observations, informed by *professional judgment and knowledge* of the industry, [and] that the discretion afforded MSHA inspectors by the

Act and the relevant regulations is not grounded in public policy and is not protected by the discretionary function exception." *Id.* at 898 (emphasis added). The court noted the language in *Berkovitz*, *supra*, that "If the determination is to be made by the mere 'application of objective scientific standards,' however, plaintiff's claim would not be barred." 17 F.3d at 897, quoting *Berkovitz*, 486 U.S. at 545. The Sixth Circuit continued:

> As the Court in *Berkovitz* held, the applicability of the discretionary function exception in such situations turns on whether the MSHA inspector is authorized to make such assessments as a matter of public policy or whether those determinations are supposed to be the product of more *objective criteria*. We hold that neither the Act nor the MSHA regulations authorize mine safety inspectors to conduct their inspections on the basis of "social, economic or political policy."

17 F.3d at 897 (emphasis added). *But see Lawson v. United States*, 124 F.3d 198 (6th Cir. 1997) (table) (reported at 1997 WL 530540), in which the Sixth Circuit held that "the Coast Guard's decision to place navigation lights on the Lorain breakwater is a discretionary one exempted from the Suits in Admiralty Act by the discretionary function exception." *Id.* at **6. However, the Sixth Circuit also noted that

> Unlike *Eklof* [*Marine Corp. v. United States*, 762 F.2d 200 (2d Cir. 1985)] or *Somerset* [*Seafood Co. v. United States*, 193 F.2d 631 (4th Cir. 1951)], this is not a situation where the misplacement of a buoy by the Coast Guard became "a trap for the ignorant or unwary rather than a warning of danger." *Somerset*, 193 F.2d at 635 (quoted by *Eklof*, 762 F.2d at 203). The placement of two

> lights on the Lorain breakwater, one on either end, did not lure boaters into the breakwater.

WL at **5. The facts of *Lawson* are in stark contrast to the facts in the present case, where the only evidence in the record is that the red channel marker drew boaters to the wreck, thereby "making a bad situation worse." Doc. 30, Ex. 17, pp. 8-9; Ex. 14, p. 2.

By contrast to the Eleventh Circuit's placing the burden on the plaintiff to "establish that the discretionary function exception does not apply," App. 5, the Ninth Circuit has held that "it is the government's burden to demonstrate the applicability of the discretionary function exception." *Whisnant v. United States*, 400 F.3d 1177, 1181 (9th Cir. 2005); *Bear Medicine v. United States ex rel. Sec'y of the Dep't of the Interior*, 241 F.3d 1208, 1213 (9th Cir. 2001). The *Whisnant* court, in applying "the second *Gaubert/Berkovitz* prong," noted that it had "recently remarked upon the difficulty of charting a clear path through the weaving lines of precedent regarding what decisions are susceptible to social, economic, or political policy analysis." 400 F.3d at 1181 (citing *O'Toole v. United States*, 295 F.3d 1029, 1035 (9th Cir. 2002)). The *Whisnant* court noted that the Ninth Circuit had established a body of precedent that "*matters of scientific and professional judgment – particularly judgments concerning safety* – are rarely considered to be susceptible to social, economic, or political policy." *Id.* at 1181 (emphasis added). Contrary to the Eleventh Circuit, the Ninth Circuit treats *Indian Towing* as remaining good law, noting that,

> although the analysis in *Indian Towing* is not addressed to the discretionary function exception, . . . subsequent Supreme Court precedent has treated *Indian Towing* as relevant authority in

> this area, *see Berkovitz*, 486 U.S. at 538, n. 3 ("the decision in *Indian Towing* . . . illuminates the appropriate scope of the discretionary function exception.").

Id. at 1182, n. 2. The court noted: "As we have summarized: 'The decision to adopt safety precautions may be based in policy considerations, but the *implementation of those precautions is not. . . . [S]afety measures, once undertaken, cannot be shortchanged in the name of policy.*'" *Id.* at 1182 (quoting *Bear Medicine*, 241 F.3d at 1215, 1216-17 (emphasis added)). In reversing a dismissal of a claim alleging negligent failure to remove toxic mold, the *Whisnant* court held: "Cleaning up mold involves professional and scientific judgment, not decisions of social, economic or political policy." *Id.* at 1183. Similarly, determining how to place or modify a warning sign involves professional and scientific judgment, not decisions of social, economic, or political policy.

Finally, the *Whisnant* court rejected the argument that budgetary concerns are a sufficient ground for a finding of a discretionary function:

> Were we to view inadequate funding alone as sufficient to garner the protection of the discretionary function exception, we would read the rule too narrowly and the exception too broadly. Instead, in order to effectuate Congress's intent to compensate individuals harmed by government negligence, the FTCA, as a remedial statute, should be construed liberally, and its exceptions should be read narrowly.

Id. at 1184.

In *Ayala v. United States*, 980 F.2d 1342, 1349 (10th Cir. 1992), the Tenth Circuit held that "technical judgments

made by [a federal agent are not] protected by the discretionary function exception." The court contrasted the discretionary decision to act with the technical judgment exercised:

> Where the particular decision challenged is not a policy-based decision, there is no reason to provide the government with immunity. In this case, the particular decision being challenged is not Marshall's decision to offer technical advice, but his recommendation of where to connect the lights to the continuous mining machine.

Id. Similarly, here, the decision being challenged is not the decision *whether* to mark the Fort Morgan wreck, but the decision of *how* to mark it and *where* to place the marker.

The District of Columbia Circuit has adopted a reasonable construction of the second prong of *Gaubert* in *Cope v. Scott*, 45 F.3d 445 (D.C. Cir. 1995). The Court first noted the overbreadth of the government's argument:

> Determining whether a decision is "essentially political, social, or economic," . . . is admittedly difficult, since nearly every governmental action is, at least to some extent, subject to "policy analysis." . . . "Budgetary constraints," for example, "underlie virtually all government activity." . . . At oral argument, counsel for the government asserted that these underlying fiscal constraints should therefore exempt "virtually all government activity." With the exception of discretion exercised by bad drivers, the government appears to argue that decisions that involve choice and the faintest hint of policy concerns are discretionary and subject to the exception. This approach, however, would not only eviscerate the second step of the analysis set out in *Berkovitz* and *Gaubert*, but it would allow the exception to swallow the FTCA's

> sweeping waiver of sovereign immunity. . . . It was thus not surprising that, when pressed at oral argument, government counsel was unable to provide, under its theory, even one example of a discretionary decision that would not be exempt for failure to implicate policy concerns.
>
> The government reads the exception far too broadly. The question is not whether there is any discretion at all, but whether the discretion is "*grounded* in the policy of the regulatory regime." *Gaubert*, 499 U.S. at 325 (emphasis added). The mere association of a decision with regulatory concerns is not enough; exempt decisions are those "fraught with . . . public policy considerations." . . . The mere presence of choice – even if that choice involves whether money should be spent – does not trigger the exception.

Id. at 448-49. After also rejecting efforts by the plaintiff Cope to "restrict [the] application" of the exception, *id.* at 449, the *Cope* court noted that "we have consistently held that the discretionary function exception applies 'only where "the question is not negligence but social wisdom, not due care but political practicability, not reasonableness but economic expediency."'" *Id.* at 450 (citations omitted). The court allowed a discretionary function defense to an allegation that the road was maintained in too slippery a condition, but rejected a discretionary function defense regarding the signage on the road:

> In contrast to our decision regarding the road surface, however, we find that the discretion regarding where and what type of signs to post is not the kind of discretion protected by the discretionary function exception. While it may be true, as the government claims, that the placement of signs involves judgments because engineering and aesthetic

> concerns determine where they are placed, such judgments are not necessarily protected from suit; only if they are "fraught with public policy considerations" do they fall within the exception, and we do not think that is the case here. The "*engineering judgment*" the government relies on is no more a matter of policy than were the "*objective scientific principles*" that the *Berkovitz* Court distinguished from exempt exercises of policy judgment. *See* 486 U.S. at 545.

Id. at 451-52 (emphasis added). The Court's conclusion is highly applicable to the analysis in this case:

> The Park Service has already posted signs in an effort to alert drivers to safety hazards on the road. In light of these factors, the Park Service has understandably been unable to articulate how the placement of additional or different signs on Beach Drive implicates the type of economic, social, or political concerns that the discretionary function exception protects from suit under the FTCA.

Id. at 452. Similarly, the Coast Guard has already posted an aid to navigation in an effort to alert boaters to the known safety hazard posed by the Fort Morgan wreck. It has been unable to articulate how the placement of a different sign would implicate the type of economic, social, or political concerns that the discretionary function exception protects from suits under the SAA and the PVA. The Eleventh Circuit's holding to the contrary conflicts with the holdings of the District of Columbia Circuit in *Cope v. Scott* and the other circuits, as discussed above.

The fact that the Eleventh Circuit's interpretation is inconsistent with *Gaubert* and with the Congressional intent behind the FTCA, the SAA, and the PVA is also shown by *Dolan v. United States Postal Service*, 546 U.S. 481, 126 S.Ct.

1252 (2006), where the Court held that the FTCA exception found in 28 U.S.C. § 2680(b) for claims arising out of "the loss, miscarriage, or negligent transmission of letters or postal matter" did not apply to a claim alleging negligently leaving mail on the plaintiff's porch in such a way that she tripped and fell over it. Pertinent here, the Court noted that a narrow construction of the exception is more consistent with the Congressional intent than a broad construction:

> Finally, it should be noted that this case does not implicate the general rule that "a waiver of the Government's sovereign immunity will be strictly construed in terms of its scope, in favor of the sovereign," *Lane v. Peña*, 518 U.S. 187, 192 (1996). As *Kosak* [*v. United States*, 465 U.S. 848 (1984)] explains, this principle is "unhelpful" in the FTCA context, where "unduly generous interpretations of the exceptions run the risk of defeating the central purpose of the statute," 465 U.S., at 853, n. 9, which "waives the Government's immunity from suit in sweeping language."

Dolan, 546 U.S. at ___, 126 S.Ct. at 1260 (some citations omitted). The Eleventh Circuit's "unduly generous interpretations of the exceptio[n]" defeats the purpose of the statutes. That purpose is to provide an action against the United States "[i]n cases where . . . if a private person or property were involved, a proceeding in admiralty could be maintained." 46 U.S.C. app. § 742. Given that a private individual would be liable under the Wreck Act, 33 U.S.C. § 409, for making poor choices about the adequacy of a marker of his sunken vessel, the government is not conducting an immunized discretionary function simply because government agents rather than private individuals are choosing how to mark the wreck.

CONCLUSION

Congress did not do a futile thing when it enacted the Suits in Admiralty Act, the Public Vessels Act, and the Federal Tort Claims Act. In the states and waters under the jurisdiction of the Eleventh Circuit, however, those Acts have little or no field of operation unless and until this Court steps in and corrects the Eleventh Circuit's expansive construction of the *Gaubert* "public policy" aspect of the discretionary function test. Other circuits have developed workable applications of this test, including analysis of whether a particular decision involved only "technical safety assessments," "professional, scientific, or engineering standards," or "objective criteria." This Court should approve those workable tests and disapprove the expansive construction by the Eleventh Circuit whereby any decision or choice by any federal employee constitutes an immunized discretionary function activity.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVID G. WIRTES, JR.
Counsel of Record
JOHN T. CROWDER, JR.
GREGORY B. BREEDLOVE
RICHARD EDWIN LAMBERTH
GEORGE M. DENT, III
CUNNINGHAM, BOUNDS, CROWDER,
BROWN AND BREEDLOVE, L.L.C.
1601 Dauphin Street
P. O. Box 66705
Mobile, Alabama 36660
(251) 471-6191
(251) 479-1031 (Facsimile)

Counsel for Petitioners

March 20, 2007.

466 F.3d 955

United States Court of Appeals, Eleventh Circuit.
Eddie Tyrone CRANFORD,
Plaintiff-Counter-Defendant-Appellant,
v.
UNITED STATES of America,
Defendant-Counter-Claimant-
Third-Party-Plaintiff-Appellee,
v.
Howard Melech, Diane G. Melech, as Personal Representative and Administratrix of the Estate of Ronald C. Melech, deceased,
Third-Party-Defendants-Appellants.
No. 06-10685.

Oct. 5, 2006.

David G. Wirtes, Jr., Richard Edwin Lamberth, Cunningham, Bounds, Yance, Crowder, Brown & Breedlove, LLC, Mobile, AL, for Appellants.

Stephen Gerard Flynn, Bruce Allan Ross, U.S. Dept. of Justice, Washington, DC, for U.S.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Southern District of Alabama.

Before BIRCH, PRYOR and FAY, Circuit Judges.

PRYOR, Circuit Judge:

The issue in this appeal is whether the "discretionary function exception" to the waivers of sovereign immunity in the Suits in Admiralty Act and the Public Vessels Act applies to decisions of federal officials in marking and choosing not to remove a submerged wreck. Eddie Tyrone Cranford, Howard Melech, and Diane Melech filed complaints against

the United States regarding personal injuries and death suffered in an allision of a pleasure boat and a submerged wreck. Their complaints alleged negligence by the government, and the district court dismissed the complaints for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Because we conclude the marking of a submerged wreck and the refusal to remove it are discretionary decisions grounded in social, political, and economic policy, we affirm.

I. BACKGROUND

On August 9, 2003, a seventeen-foot motor boat operated by Ronald Melech and carrying Howard Melech and Eddie Cranford struck a submerged object in Mobile Bay, approximately 100 yards north of Fort Morgan beach. At the time of the allision, the boat was traveling eastward parallel to the shore at approximately 30 miles an hour. Upon impact, Cranford and Ronald Melech were thrown from the boat. Cranford was injured, and Ronald Melech died. Howard Melech, who was also injured, helped Cranford back into the boat, but Ronald Melech's body was not found until the next day.

The motor boat struck a submerged vessel, known as the Fort Morgan Wreck. Where closest to the surface of the water, the wreck is between 6 and 18 inches below the surface. The Melechs and Cranford presented evidence, which the district court concluded is likely to be admissible, that the submerged wreck is a former United States Army Mine Planter deliberately sunk in the 1930s by the federal Works Progress Administration to serve as a breakwater. The government asserts that it does not know if these facts are accurate.

The Coast Guard initially charted and marked the wreck in 1992 with a temporary lighted buoy. In 1996, the Coast Guard replaced the temporary buoy with a telephone-pole-type piling, driven into the bed of Mobile Bay approximately 164 feet north-northwest of the part of the wreck closest to the surface. The piling bore two orange and white signs with the words "Danger Wreck." Over the years, the Coast Guard received reports of vessels striking the wreck despite the marking. After a request from the Alabama Department of Conservation, the Coast Guard again modified the marker on August 5, 2003, and replaced the signs with a flashing light and a six-foot-wide red triangle with the letters "WR2." At the time of the allision, the marker consisted of the piling, the flashing light, and the red triangle.

Cranford, Howard Melech, and Diane Melech, the wife of the deceased Ronald Melech, filed separate complaints against the government in federal court, which were consolidated for purposes of discovery. They alleged that negligence of the government in marking the Fort Morgan Wreck and in refusing to remove it caused the death of Ronald Melech and personal injuries to Cranford and Howard Melech. They alleged that the district court had jurisdiction over their claims under the Federal Tort Claims Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 1346(b), 2671-2680, the Suits in Admiralty Act, 46 U.S.C. app. §§ 741-52, the Public Vessels Act, 46 U.S.C. app. §§ 781-90, and the Wreck Act, 33 U.S.C. app. §§ 409, 411, 412, 414, 415.

The government moved to dismiss the complaints for lack of subject matter jurisdiction on the ground that the United States had not waived its sovereign immunity. The district court granted the motions. The district court relied on *United States v. Gaubert,* 499 U.S. 315, 111 S.Ct. 1267,

113 L.Ed.2d 335 (1991), and concluded that the marking of the Fort Morgan Wreck and refusal to remove it fell within the "discretionary function exception" of the Federal Tort Claims Act, *see* 28 U.S.C. § 2680(a), and that the waivers of sovereign immunity in the Suits in Admiralty Act and the Public Vessels Act did not apply.

II. STANDARD OF REVIEW

"We review *de novo* the district court's dismissal of the action for lack of subject matter jurisdiction." *Ochran v. United States,* 117 F.3d 495, 499 (11th Cir.1997). "[W]e view the facts in the light most favorable to the plaintiff." *Parise v. Delta Airlines, Inc.,* 141 F.3d 1463, 1465 (11th Cir.1998).

III. DISCUSSION

To resolve this appeal, we must address three matters: (1) the legal standard for the discretionary function exception; (2) whether the marking of the Fort Morgan Wreck falls within the exception; and (3) whether the refusal to remove the wreck falls within the exception. Although the parties are in sharp conflict on every issue, we agree with the arguments of the government and the decision of the district court.

A. The Discretionary Function Exception Is Governed by Gaubert, Not Drake Towing.

The United States is immune from suit unless it consents to be sued. *United States v. Sherwood,* 312 U.S. 584, 586, 61 S.Ct. 767, 769, 85 L.Ed. 1058 (1941). The Suits in Admiralty Act (SAA), 46 U.S.C. app. §§ 741-52,

provides a waiver of sovereign immunity and the "sole jurisdictional basis for admiralty claims against the United States," *Mid-South Holding Co., Inc. v. United States,* 225 F.3d 1201, 1203 (11th Cir.2000), that do not involve public vessels, *see Marine Coatings of Ala., Inc. v. United States,* 71 F.3d 1558, 1560-61 & n. 3 (11th Cir.1996). The Public Vessels Act (PVA), 46 U.S.C. app. §§ 781-90, provides a waiver of sovereign immunity for admiralty claims involving public vessels. Both waivers are subject to the discretionary function exception of the Federal Tort Claims Act (FTCA). *See Mid-South Holding,* 225 F.3d at 1203-04 (applying exception to waiver in SAA); *U.S. Fire Ins. Co. v. United States,* 806 F.2d 1529, 1535 (11th Cir.1986) (applying exception to waiver in PVA).

Because the government has raised a factual challenge to subject matter jurisdiction, the Melechs and Cranford must establish that the discretionary function exception does not apply. *See OSI, Inc. v. United States,* 285 F.3d 947, 951 (11th Cir.2002). The Supreme Court in *Gaubert* "developed a two-step test to determine whether the government's conduct meets the discretionary function exception." *Miles v. Naval Aviation Museum Found., Inc.,* 289 F.3d 715, 720 (11th Cir.2002) (citing *Gaubert,* 499 U.S. at 322-23, 111 S.Ct. at 1273-74). We consider first whether the conduct involves "'an element of judgment or choice,'" *OSI, Inc.,* 285 F.3d at 950 (quoting *Gaubert,* 499 U.S. at 322, 111 S.Ct. at 1273), which will be the case unless "'a federal statute, regulation, or policy specifically prescribes a course of action embodying a *fixed* or *readily ascertainable* standard.'" *Hughes v. United States,* 110 F.3d 765, 768 (11th Cir.1997) (quoting *Autery v. United States,* 992 F.2d 1523, 1529 (11th Cir.1993)). The conduct need not be

"confined to the policy or planning level." *Gaubert,* 499 U.S. at 325, 111 S.Ct. at 1275.

We then ask whether the judgment or choice is grounded in considerations of public policy, because the "purpose of the [discretionary function] exception is to 'prevent judicial "second-guessing" of legislative and administrative decisions grounded in social, economic, and political policy through the medium of an action in tort.'" *Id.* at 322-23, 111 S.Ct. at 1273-74 (quoting *United States v. S.A. Empresa de Viacao Aerea Rio Grandense (Varig Airlines),* 467 U.S. 797, 814, 104 S.Ct. 2755, 2765, 81 L.Ed.2d 660 (1984)). "When established governmental policy, as expressed or implied by statute, regulation, or agency guidelines, allows a [g]overnment agent to exercise discretion, it must be presumed that the agent's acts are grounded in policy when exercising that discretion." *Id.* at 324, 111 S.Ct. at 1274. Our inquiry does not focus either on the subjective intent of the government agent, *id.* at 325, 111 S.Ct. at 1275, or on whether the agent actually weighed policy considerations, *OSI, Inc.,* 285 F.3d at 950-51, but "on the nature of the actions taken and on whether they are susceptible to policy analysis," *Gaubert,* 499 U.S. at 325, 111 S.Ct. at 1275. To succeed, the Melechs and Cranford must establish "that the challenged actions are not the kind of [discretionary] conduct that can be said to be grounded in the policy of the regulatory regime." *Id.* Such conduct includes, for example, "dr [iving] an automobile on a mission connected with . . . official duties." *Id.* at 325 n. 7, 111 S.Ct. at 1275 n. 7.

The Melechs and Cranford contend that we should be guided by two of our earlier decisions: *Drake Towing Co., Inc. v. Meisner Marine Construction Co.,* 765 F.2d 1060 (11th Cir.1985), and *U.S. Fire Insurance Co. v. United*

States, 806 F.2d 1529. We disagree. Our holdings in *Drake Towing* and *U.S. Fire Insurance* both turned expressly on the principle that "operational" conduct falls outside the discretionary function exception, *see Drake Towing,* 765 F.2d at 1064; *U.S. Fire Insurance,* 806 F.2d at 1535-37, and the Supreme Court rejected that principle in *Gaubert. See* 499 U.S. at 326, 111 S.Ct. at 1275; *see also Autery,* 992 F.2d at 1527. We do not follow precedents that are "clearly inconsistent" with an intervening decision of the Supreme Court. *See Garrett v. Univ. of Ala. at Birmingham Bd. of Trs.,* 344 F.3d 1288, 1292 (11th Cir.2003).

The Melechs and Cranford would have us rule that the discretionary function exception does not apply to the execution of a governmental decision, but this argument merely restates the operational conduct distinction rejected in *Gaubert.* The Melechs and Cranford rely on *Indian Towing Co. v. United States,* 350 U.S. 61, 76 S.Ct. 122, 100 L.Ed. 48 (1955), and contend that the discretionary function exception does not apply "once the [g]overnment exercise[s] its discretion to warn the public of a danger, [because] it ha[s] a mandatory 'hornbook tort law' obligation to perform its task 'in a careful manner.'" This argument fails. We have previously explained that "[t]his interpretation of *Indian Towing* . . . has been severely undercut, if not altogether disavowed, by the Supreme Court in *Gaubert.*" *Ochran,* 117 F.3d at 505, and in any event, the government did not invoke the discretionary function exception in *Indian Towing, see Monzon v. United States,* 253 F.3d 567, 572 (11th Cir.2001).

B. The Marking of the Fort Morgan Wreck Falls Within the Discretionary Function Exception.

The Melechs and Cranford challenge several decisions of the Coast Guard in marking the Fort Morgan Wreck, such as placing the marker 164 feet away from the wreck and using only one marker, but all of these decisions involved elements of judgment or choice. The pertinent statute, regulations, and internal policy allow the Coast Guard broad discretion in deciding how to mark a wreck. The statute that grants the Coast Guard authority to mark wrecks provides, "The Secretary *may* mark . . . any sunken vessel or other obstruction existing on the navigable waters . . . of the United States *in such manner and for so long as, in his judgment,* the needs of maritime navigation require." 14 U.S.C. § 86 (emphasis added). The relevant regulations provide that the Coast Guard "*may* mark for the protection of maritime navigation any structure, sunken vessel or other obstruction that is not suitably marked by the owner." 33 C.F.R. § 64.33(a) (emphasis added). The Aids to Navigation Administration Manual (ATON Manual), which contains internal guidelines of the Coast Guard regarding the marking of wrecks, states that "the Coast Guard retains the discretion to deviate or authorize deviation from" its "requirements." The ATON Manual creates "no duties or obligations to the public to comply with the procedures" described in it, and the ATON Manual states that "no member of the public should rely upon the[] procedures as a representation by the Coast Guard as to the manner of performance of [the] aids to navigation mission." The Melechs and Cranford fail to identify "'a federal statute, regulation, or policy [that] specifically prescribes a course of action embodying a *fixed* or *readily ascertainable* standard.'" *Hughes,* 110 F.3d at 768 (quoting *Autery,* 992 F.2d at 1529).

The closer question is whether the decisions of the Coast Guard in marking the Fort Morgan Wreck were "susceptible to policy analysis" and "the kind of conduct that can be said to be grounded in the policy of the regulatory regime." *Gaubert*, 499 U.S. at 325, 111 S.Ct. at 1275. The government persuasively explains that decisions in marking a wreck involve social, political, and economic policy considerations, such as taking into account the knowledge and customs of international mariners, balancing the needs of pleasure and commercial watercraft, and evaluating agency resource constraints, which include but are not limited to financial concerns. The Melechs and Cranford respond that these considerations are not "true policy judgments." They assert that these considerations are merely the application of professional standards, not policy decisions; all discretionary conduct by the government involves budgetary considerations; and none of the asserted considerations implicate "national policy."

We agree with the government for three reasons. First, the contention that the Coast Guard applied professional standards "is just another way of saying that the considerations . . . are so precisely formulated that decisions at the operational level never involve the exercise of discretion within the meaning of [the discretionary function exception], a notion that [the Supreme Court] ha[s] . . . rejected." *Id.* at 331, 111 S.Ct. at 1278. It "may be that certain decisions resting on mathematical calculations, for example, involve no choice or judgment in carrying out the calculations," but the decisions of the Coast Guard in marking a wreck "are not of that genre." *Id.* Second, although "[w]e recognize that . . . budgetary constraints are almost always important to government decisions," *Ochran,* 117 F.3d at 502, and "[f]inancial considerations

alone may not make a decision one involving policy," *Hughes,* 110 F.3d at 769, the decisions of the Coast Guard involved more than financial considerations. Third, nothing in our case law supports the Melechs' and Cranford's assertion that policy considerations must implicate "national" policy. The Melechs and Cranford ask us to review evidence regarding the actual considerations of the decisionmakers for the Coast Guard, but we do not focus either on the subjective intent of the government agents, *Gaubert,* 499 U.S. at 325, 111 S.Ct. at 1275, or on whether the agents actually weighed policy considerations, *OSI, Inc.,* 285 F.3d at 950-51.

C. The Decision Not To Remove the Fort Morgan Wreck Falls Within the Discretionary Function Exception.

The Melechs and Cranford also challenge the refusal of the government to remove the Fort Morgan Wreck. They contend that this decision fails the first step of the *Gaubert* test because a section of the Wreck Act, 33 U.S.C. § 409, allegedly imposes a nondiscretionary duty on the government to remove the Fort Morgan Wreck. The Melechs and Cranford assert that the government, as the alleged owner of the sunken vessel, must "commence the immediate removal of [the vessel] and prosecute such removal diligently." *Id.* We disagree.

Although we view in the light most favorable to the Melechs and Cranford the evidence that the government deliberately sank the vessel for a legitimate public purpose, the removal requirement in the Wreck Act does not apply to the government in this circumstance. *Cf. Chute v. United States,* 610 F.2d 7, 11 (1st Cir.1979) (concluding that deliberate creation of a wreck by government for

Navy target practice not subject to Wreck Act). The Wreck Act became law as part of the Rivers and Harbors Appropriation Act of 1899, and it must be read together with the other sections of that statute. *See Swain v. Schweiker,* 676 F.2d 543, 546 (11th Cir.1982) ("[S]tatute must be considered as a whole. . . . "). Section 409 specifically prohibits the obstruction of navigable waters by vessels and requires owners promptly to remove sunken vessels, but an earlier section of the statute, section 403, speaks to "[o]bstruction of navigable waters *generally*" and provides that the government may authorize the creation of obstructions, including breakwaters. 33 U.S.C. § 403 (emphasis added). Were section 403 not to exist, it would be absurd to read section 409 to require the government immediately to remove a vessel that it deliberately sank for a public purpose. *See Regions Bank v. Provident Bank, Inc.,* 345 F.3d 1267, 1276 (11th Cir.2003) ("[T]he Supreme Court has repeatedly held that '[i]f possible, [a court] should avoid construing [a] statute in a way that produces [ ] absurd results.'" (quoting *Dewsnup v. Timm,* 502 U.S. 410, 427, 112 S.Ct. 773, 783, 116 L.Ed.2d 903 (1992))); *see also Green v. Bock Laundry Mach. Co.,* 490 U.S. 504, 527, 109 S.Ct. 1981, 1994, 104 L.Ed.2d 557 (1989) (Scalia, J., concurring) (noting that a statute must be construed to avoid "unthinkable" and "bizarre" results). In addition, the last clause of section 409 evidences that the removal requirement does not apply to the government in *any* circumstance, because failure to comply with that requirement subjects a sunken vessel to discretionary removal by the government. 33 U.S.C. § 409 (stating that failure to remove a sunken vessel "shall be considered as an abandonment" of the vessel and "subject the [vessel] to removal by the United States"); *see also Buffalo Bayou Transp. Co. v. United States,* 375 F.2d 675, 677 (5th

Cir.1967) (holding that section 409 does not require the United States to remove "each sunken vessel in navigable waters").

The remaining issue involves whether the refusal of the government to remove a wreck that it intentionally sank for a public purpose necessarily implicates public policy. The Melechs and Cranford understandably offer no argument that this decision was not "susceptible to policy analysis." *Gaubert,* 499 U.S. at 325, 111 S.Ct. at 1275. We conclude that the decision not to remove the wreck is shielded from judicial second-guessing by the discretionary function exception.

IV. CONCLUSION

The dismissal of the complaints of the Melechs and Cranford is

AFFIRMED.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
SOUTHERN DIVISION

REBECCA NELSON, **Plaintiff,** **v.** **UNITED STATES OF AMERICA** **Defendant.**	**CIVIL ACTION NO. 04-560-CB-M**
EDDIE TYRONE CRANFORD, **Plaintiff,** **v.** **UNITED STATES OF AMERICA** **Defendant.**	**CIVIL ACTION NO. 04-561-CB-M**
HOWARD MELECH, **Plaintiff,** **v.** **UNITED STATES OF AMERICA** **Defendant.**	**CIVIL ACTION NO. 04-562-CB-M**
DIANE G. MELECH, et al., **Plaintiffs,** **v.** **UNITED STATES OF AMERICA** **Defendant.**	**CIVIL ACTION NO. 04-563-CB-M**

ORDER

The four above-styled cases arise from two separate boating accidents involving allisions with the same submerged object on the same date, and have been consolidated for purposes of discovery under civil action number CV04-560-CB-M. Civil action CV04-560-CB-M, brought by Rebecca Nelson, involves one accident, and the three other cases arise from the other accident. The motions before the court involve only the latter three cases.

Presently before the court are three substantially similar Motions to Dismiss for Lack of Jurisdiction or for Summary Judgment brought by the United States in civil actions numbered 04-561 (Cranford, doc. 23), 04-562 (H. Melech, doc. 27), and 04-563 (D. Melech, doc. 23). Additionally, Cranford and Howard Melech have filed identical Cross-Motions (docs 34 and 38, respectively) for Summary Judgment on the defendant's counterclaims and third-party claims,[1] but Diane Melech[2] has not done so.

---

[1] The defendant asserts its counter-claim and third-party claims in each of these three cases against the plaintiffs whom they allege were negligent and are liable to the government for contribution in the event that the government is found liable to any of the plaintiffs. While the claim against the named plaintiff in each such action is properly denominated a counter-claim and the claims against the other plaintiffs in that same action are properly denominated third-party claims, the court will refer to all such claims by the generic term 'third-party claims' for purposes of clarity.

[2] Defendant's claims are brought against Diane Melech in her representative capacity based upon the alleged actions of her deceased husband, Roland Melech, who was operating the boat at the time of the allision.

SUMMARY JUDGMENT STANDARD

The standard for summary judgment motions is applicable to plaintiff's cross motions for summary judgment as well as certain aspects of the defendant's motions. The court addresses the standard under Rule 12(b)(1) for a factual attack on the jurisdiction of the court below. "[T]he purpose of Rule 56 is to enable a party who believes there is no genuine dispute as to a specific essential fact to demand at least one sworn averment of that fact before the lengthy process of litigation continues." *Lujan v. National Wildlife Fed'n,* 497 U.S. 871, 888-89 (1990). Summary judgment is appropriate where the nonmovant "fails to make a showing sufficient to establish the existence of an element essential to that party's case, and on which that party will bear the burden of proof at trial." *Celotex Corp. v. Catrett,* 477 U.S. 317, 322 (1986). A dispute of material fact "is 'genuine' . . . if the evidence is such that a reasonable jury could return a verdict for the nonmoving party." *Anderson v. Liberty Lobby,* 477 U.S. 242, 248 (1986). The nonmovant "must present affirmative evidence in order to defeat a properly supported motion for summary judgment." *Liberty Lobby,* 477 U.S. at 257. Mere conclusory statements or reliance on the pleadings are insufficient. *Celotex,* 477 U.S. at 324.

In assessing whether the movant is entitled to summary judgment in its favor, the Court must review the evidence and all reasonable factual inferences arising from it in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party. *Welch v. Celotex Corp.,* 951 F.2d 1235, 1237 (11th Cir. 1992). The Court must avoid weighing conflicting evidence or making credibility determinations, *Liberty Lobby*, 477 U.S. at 255.

> [A]lthough the court should review the record as a whole, it must disregard all evidence favorable to the moving party that the jury is not required to believe. That is, the court should give credence to the evidence favoring the nonmovant as well as that "evidence supporting the moving party that is uncontradicted and unimpeached, at least to the extent that that evidence comes from disinterested witnesses."

Reeves v. Sanderson Plumbing Products, Inc., 530 U.S. 133, 151 (2000) (citations omitted).

GOVERNMENT'S MOTION

The government makes a factual attack upon this court's jurisdiction over this case, arguing that the challenged actions fall within the discretionary function exception to the government's waiver of sovereign immunity. In a factual attack on jurisdiction under Rule 12(b)(1), the court may consider matters outside the pleadings and is free to weigh the evidence concerning jurisdiction so long as the issues do not implicate the merits of plaintiffs' action. See *Morrison v. Amway Corp.*, 323 F.3d 920, 924-25 and n.5 (11th Cir. 2003). The court would, however, find jurisdiction and consider a direct attack on the merits of the underlying action under the summary judgment standard if the facts necessary to determine jurisdiction also implicate the merits of that action. *Id.*

UNDISPUTED FACTS.

The Accident

On August 9, 2003, Howard Melech's seventeen-foot powerboat struck a submerged obstruction in Mobile Bay,

approximately 100 yards north of Fort Morgan beach, and just to the west of the public pier. At the time of the allision, the owner, Howard Melech, was seated at the rear of the boat. His brother, Ronald Melech, was standing at and operating the controls. Their friend, Eddie Tyrone Cranford, was standing to Ronald Melech's right. The boat was traveling eastward parallel to the shore at approximately 30 miles per hour at the time of the allision. Upon impact, Howard Melech was thrown forward and was knocked unconscious. Mr. Cranford and Ronald Melech were thrown from the boat. Mr. Cranford was injured but was able to return to the boat with help from Howard Melech, but Ronald Melech died from his injuries. His body was not recovered until the next day.

Marking the "Fort Morgan Wreck"

The submerged vessel, known by the Coast Guard as the Fort Morgan Wreck, was marked at the time of the allision by a flashing red beacon on a telephone-pole-type piling permanently driven into the bed of the Bay 164 feet north-northwest of the highest part of the wreck. At its shallowest end, the wreck is between approximately 6 and 18 inches below the surface. There was a six-foot-wide red triangle with "WR2" written on it affixed to the top of the piling.

The Coast Guard charted and initially marked the wreck in 1992. It placed a piling and dayboard marker at the site in 1996. The piling was placed approximately 164 feet north-northwest of the shallowest part of the wreck. Following a request from the Alabama Department of Conservation, the Coast Guard modified the marker on August 5, 2003, approximately four days prior to the

allisions at issue in these cases. The modifications replaced the prior signs on the piling with the flashing light and the red triangle. Prior to that, the piling was configured with two orange and white signs which simply said "Danger, Wreck" and had no light.

There is evidence that the submerged object they struck was a former U.S. Army Mine Planter which had been deliberately sunk in the 1930's by the federal Works Progress Administration to serve as a breakwater for the Fort Morgan State Park.[3]

ANALYSIS

The government asserts that this court lacks jurisdiction over this action because the plaintiff's claims fall within the discretionary function exception to the applicable statutory waiver of sovereign immunity. The United States is immune from suit except where it consents to be sued, and the terms of its consent define the court's jurisdiction. *U.S. v. Sherwood,* 312 U.S. 584, 586 (1941). In relation to certain maritime matters, it has waived sovereign immunity through

[3] Despite a challenge by the government to the admissibility of the evidence offered on this point, the court finds the evidence presented is likely to be admissible and would be sufficient to allow a reasonable inference that the object was the wreck of the LT. COL. ROBERT C. GILDART. The evidence challenged by defendant as hearsay appears, on the limited information provided, to be potentially admissible pursuant to F.R.E. 803(16) and/or (20). In addition, the court notes that at least one government record identifies the wreck as a former minelayer, and further notes that the government, despite its extensive records of such matters, has not offered any alternative identification of the vessel or its owner. However, the court does not make a final determination of the admissibility or sufficiency of this evidence at trial as the outcome would be identical were that fact deemed established.

the Suits in Admiralty Act ("SSA [sic]"), 46 U.S.C. app. §741, *et seq.,* and the Public Vessels Act ("PVA"), 46 U.S.C. §§781-790. However, the discretionary function exception to the Federal Tort Claims Act, 28 U.S.C. §2680(a), applies to actions under the SAA and PVA, as well. See *Mid-South Holding Co. v. U.S.,* 225 F.3d 1201, 1203 (11th Cir. 2000) (applies to SAA); *U.S. Fire Ins. Co. v. U.S.*, 806 F.2d 1529 (11th Cir. 1986) (applies to PVA). The government has excepted from its waiver "[a]ny claim . . . based upon the exercise or performance or the failure to exercise or perform a discretionary function or duty on the part of a federal agency or an employee of the Government, whether or not the discretion involved be abused." 28 U.S.C. §2680(a). The burden of proof concerning the discretionary function exception, as with all assertions of federal jurisdiction, lies with the party asserting jurisdiction, in this case, the plaintiff. See *OSI, Inc. v.* U.S., 285 F.3d 947, 951 (11th Cir. 2002).

The court first considers whether a statute, policy or regulation mandates that a government agent perform the particular function in a specific manner. *U.S. v. Gaubert,* 499 U.S. 315 (1991). If the agent's discretion is thus circumscribed, an act violating that duty is not discretionary. If however, the agent has discretion, the court must then determine whether the judgment afforded the agent is the type of judgment that the discretionary function exception was designed to shield. *Id.* at 322-23. "When established governmental policy, as expressed or implied by statute, regulation, or agency guidelines, allows a Government agent to exercise discretion, it must be presumed that the agent's acts are grounded in policy when exercising that discretion. For a complaint to survive a motion to dismiss, it must allege facts which would

support a finding that the challenged actions are not the kind of conduct that can be said to be grounded in the policy of the regulatory regime. The focus of the inquiry is not on the agent's subjective intent in exercising the discretion conferred by statute or regulation, but on the nature of the actions taken and on whether they are susceptible to policy analysis." *Id.* at 324.

Prior Circuit Precedent:

Plaintiff asserts that, despite the intervening change wrought in the applicable standard by the Supreme Court's decision in *Gaubert,* this court is bound by principles of *stare decisis* to follow prior precedents of the Eleventh Circuit addressing the applicability of the discretionary function exception to maritime claims against the government for negligently marking hazards. Ordinarily, a district court is bound to follow the holding of a prior decision of the Court of Appeals for the circuit in which the district court is located until that binding precedent is expressly overruled. 18 Moore's Federal Practice, §134.02 [2] (Matthew Bender 3d ed.). However, in rare instances in which a subsequent decision of the Court of Appeals sitting *en banc* implicitly overrules a prior precedent, making it clear that the reasoning and decision of the Court of Appeals would have been different under the new precedent, a lower court may be forced to treat the precedent from the Court of Appeals as having been overruled. See 18 Moore's §134.05[6]. This approach would apply to an intervening decision of the Supreme Court, as well, where the intervening decision is clearly contrary to the prior panel precedent. "Federal district courts and circuit courts are bound to adhere to controlling decisions of the Supreme Court." Hutto v. Davis, 454 U.S. 370, 375

(1982). Also, "the stare decisis doctrine and its exceptions do not apply where a lower court is compelled to apply the precedent of a higher court." *Jaffee v. Wallace,* 705 F.2d 1526, 1532 (11th Cir. 1983).

Both Eleventh Circuit cases upon which plaintiff relies expressly cite the discredited standard as the basis for their ruling. Under the old rule, the Eleventh Circuit distinguished between actions taken [sic] the planning and operational stages, and held that operational decisions in which the actor chose between allowable alternatives were not entitled to be treated as discretionary decisions. See *United States Fire Ins. v. U.S.,* 806 F.2d 1529, 1535 (11th Cir. 1986) (a "governmental act is discretionary and therefore shielded from liability if it is performed 'at a planning rather than operational level and involve[s] considerations more or less important to the practicability of the Government's . . . program.'" (citations omitted)). That approach was expressly disavowed by the Supreme Court. See *Gaubert,* at 321-22. "[T]he Court of Appeals erred in holding that the exception does not reach decisions made at the operational or management level. . . . A discretionary act is one that involves choice or judgment; there is nothing in that description that refers exclusively to policymaking or planning functions. . . . Discretionary conduct is not confined to the policy or planning level." *Id.* at 325. Moreover, the Eleventh Circuit recognized this change in *OSI, Inc. v. U.S.,* 285 F.3d 947, 949 (11th Cir. 2002) ("[n]or is it limited to decisions at the policy or planning level; it may include day to day management.")

Additionally, it appears that the holding which is arguably relevant to the instant case, the Eleventh Circuit's decision in *Drake Towing Co., Inc. v. Meisner Marine Constr. Co.,* 765 F.2d 1060 (11th Cir. 1985) would

necessarily have been different had it been decided under the standard stated in *Gaubert*. The panel considered whether the Coast Guard could be sued for negligence in marking submerged rubble left from the destruction of the Dauphin Island Bridge following Hurricane Frederick in 1979. The court held that, while the government could not be sued for the discretionary decision whether to mark the rubble, once it did so, it could be held liable for negligence in its placement of the buoys. *Id.* at 1064. This holding is based squarely on the distinction rejected in *Gaubert* and implicitly overruled by that decision.

Discretion:

The statute which establishes the Coast Guard's authority to mark wrecks and other hazards to navigation provides in pertinent part:

> The Secretary *may* mark for the protection of navigation any sunken vessel or other obstruction existing on the navigable waters or waters above the continental shelf of the United States *in such manner and for so long as, in his judgment, the needs of maritime navigation require*. . . . This section shall not be construed so as to relieve the owner of any such obstruction from the duty and responsibility suitably to mark the same and remove it as required by law.

14 U.S.C. §86 (emphasis added). The statute thus does not limit the agency's discretion in deciding whether and how to mark hazards to navigation.

The regulations adopted by the agency for the marking of hazards also provide discretion. The applicable regulations state that the Coast Guard "may mark for the protection of maritime navigation any structure, sunken

vessel or other obstruction that is not suitably marked by the owner." 33 C.F.R. §64.33(a). The regulations do not limit the agency's discretion in any relevant manner.

The Coast Guard has adopted a policy on the marking of wrecks, set forth in Chapter Six of its Aids to Navigation Administration Manual ("ATON manual"). This policy does contain some specific requirements for the manner in which a wreck must be marked.[4] However, it appears that all such specific requirements contained in that publication were complied with in this case. The Coast Guard marked the wreck with a lateral mark. (¶2a) Because the wreck could safely be passed on only one side, the marker was red, indicating on which side it could be safely passed. (¶2b) The letters "WR" were part of the marker's designation. (¶2e) The marker was placed on the channel or seaward side of the wreck, in conformity with ¶2f; however, plaintiffs challenge whether the marker was placed sufficiently "near" the wreck as required by that section. However, to the extent that plaintiff looks to the policy statement to support his claim that the marker was not placed sufficiently "near" the wreck, that standard does not "embody[] a fixed or readily ascertainable standard." *Gaubert*, 499 U.S. at 322. Plaintiff has offered no evidence of a policy or generally recognized standard that would provide an objective standard that was allegedly breached in this instance.[5] The Coast Guard thus did not violate a

[4] It is undisputed that the wreck at issue was marked at the time of the wreck; plaintiffs challenge the manner in which it was marked. Thus there is no question presented whether the Coast Guard had discretion whether initially to mark a wreck.

[5] Clearly, there is some distance which is so far from an obstruction that it could no longer be considered to be within the discretion granted to the agency under this provision.

specific guideline by setting the marker 164' north-northwest of the shallowest part of the wreck, nor in modifying the marker without replacing it closer to the wreck. Cf. *Sheridan Transp. Co. v. U.S.,* 834 F.2d 467, 473 (5th Cir.1987) (recognizing that initial decision to place buoy 60' from wreck was protected as discretionary function; however, court found moving buoy another 250' away from the wreck without notifying public was negligent act not within the discretionary function exception), *appeal after remand,* 897 F.2d 795 (5th Cir.1990). Similarly, the requirements that the wreck be marked in a non-confusing manner and that it be marked so a vessel can pass safely do not provide clear limits on the agency's discretion in the manner of marking the wreck.

Plaintiffs also contend that the type of marker used was confusing but have not demonstrated that the determination of what type of marker to use was not within the discretion of the agency. Plaintiff offers significant evidence that the marker placed on the wreck was less than ideal, that the agency should have performed a survey, should have moved the marker closer, and should have used a different marking system. However, they have not shown that the Coast Guard acted beyond its discretion in making these alleged errors. For example, the internal agency dispute over how to mark the wreck demonstrates no more than that the policy upon which both sides relied did not clearly require one or the other answer. Plaintiff's expert, Alvin Cattalini, states in his report that "[t]he change to a lateral aid was driven by blind adherence to marking standards that aren't as rigid and unyielding as perceived." Plaintiffs claim is based on their assertion that the Coast Guard misapplied its discretion and that it took a too-limited view of its own discretion.

Plaintiffs also argue that the government's decisions were not the sort of decisions to which the discretionary function exception was designed to apply. This Circuit has held that the sort of conduct which is shielded from judicial review is that conduct which involves "decisions grounded in social, economic, and political policy." *Miles v. Naval Aviation Museum Foundation*, 289 F.3d 715 (11th Cir. 2002). The Supreme Court offers guidance on this determination: "if a regulation allows the employee discretion, the very existence of the regulation creates a strong presumption that a discretionary act authorized by the regulation involves consideration of the same policies which led to the promulgation of the regulations. . . . [I]t will most often be true that the general aims and policies of the controlling statute will be evident from its text." *Gaubert*, at 324. The manner in which the agency marks a wreck necessarily involves considerations of navigational safety, the main policy behind the statutes and regulations at issue; this is true even if others may doubt that the choice made maximizes such safety. To the extent the existence of cost factors in the decision may nonetheless be relevant, prioritizing expenses is an economic policy which is likewise protected. See 33 C.F.R. § 62.1(c) (providing for reasonable marking as cost permits). While the plaintiffs are correct that this formulation of the discretionary function exception to the waiver of sovereign immunity threatens to swallow the waiver, this result is nonetheless called for by the controlling precedents. The court finds the decisions challenged by the plaintiffs are the sort of policy-based determinations that fall within the discretionary function exception.

Government Ownership of the Wreck:

Plaintiffs attempt to hold the government to a higher standard under theories related to its alleged ownership of the sunken vessel. Even if the government's duty were analyzed under the provision of 14 U.S.C. §86 applicable to owners of an obstruction, the duty referred to in this section is merely to mark it 'suitably' – a standard which can not reasonably be said to limit discretion over how to mark it – or to remove it 'as required by law.' If established, the government's alleged ownership of the vessel at issue would not limit its discretion as to whether or how to mark the wreck under this section.

Nor is the court convinced by the plaintiffs' argument that, despite the government's authority to sink one of its vessels for various purposes such as the creation of a breakwater or of a naval firing range it would nonetheless be subject to a nondiscretionary duty immediately to remove the wreck under the provisions of the Wreck Act. Application of that provision to government vessels which are intentionally sunk for public purposes – as plaintiffs allege in this instance – would lead to nonsensical results. See *Baltimore, Crisfield & Onanock Line v. United States,* 140 F.2d 230, 234 (4th Cir. 1944) (battleship intentionally sunk as target in 1911 cannot create government obligation under the Wreck Act to remove it).

CROSS MOTIONS

In light of the court's holding that the government has not waived sovereign immunity with regard to the plaintiffs' claims, the court finds that the government's third-party claims against plaintiffs for contribution are moot. The court will thus dismiss these claims, as well, and thus

does not reach the cross-motions for summary judgment filed by defendants Cranford and Howard Melech or the government's motion for voluntary dismissal of the its [sic] third-party claims against defendant Cranford.

CONCLUSION

As discussed above, the court finds that it lacks jurisdiction over the plaintiffs claims. Accordingly, it is hereby **ORDERED**

1) that the defendant's Motions to Dismiss are **GRANTED**;

2) that the government's third-party claims are **DISMISSED** as Moot; and

3) that Eddie Tyrone Cranford v. U.S., CVO4-561-CB-M, Howard Melech v. U.S., CVO4-562-CB-M; and Diane G. Melech v. U.S., 04-563-CB-M are **DISMISSED with prejudice**. **DONE** this the 13th day of December, 2005.

s/Charles R. Butler, Jr.
Senior United States
District Judge

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

No. 06-10685-FF

EDDIE TYRONE CRANFORD,

Plaintiff-Counter-
Defendant-Appellant,

versus

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Defendant-Counter-
Claimant-Third-Party-
Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

HOWARD MELECH,
DIANE G. MELECH,
as Personal Representative and
Administratrix of the Estate of
Ronald C. Melech, deceased,

Third-Party-Defendants-
Appellants.

On Appeal from the United States District Court for the
Southern District of Alabama

ON PETITION(S) FOR REHEARING AND
PETITION(S) FOR REHEARING EN BANC

(Filed Dec. 21, 2006)

Before:

PER CURIAM:

The Petition(s) for Rehearing are DENIED and no Judge in regular active service on the Court having requested that the Court be polled on rehearing en banc (Rule 35, Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure), the Petition(s) for Rehearing En Banc are DENIED.

ENTERED FOR THE COURT:

/s/ William H. Pryor Jr.
UNITED STATES
CIRCUIT JUDGE

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JUL 25 2007
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

(2)

No. 06-1282

In the Supreme Court of the United States

EDDIE TYRONE CRANFORD, ET AL., PETITIONERS

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

BRIEF FOR THE UNITED STATES IN OPPOSITION

PAUL D. CLEMENT
Solicitor General
Counsel of Record
PETER D. KEISLER
Assistant Attorney General
ROBERT S. GREENSPAN
DANA J. MARTIN
Attorneys
Department of Justice
Washington, D.C. 20530-0001
(202) 514-2217

QUESTION PRESENTED

Whether the discretionary function exception to the Suits in Admiralty Act's waiver of sovereign immunity bars petitioners' tort action against the United States.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Opinions below 1
Jurisdiction 1
Statement 1
Argument 7
Conclusion 14

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases:

Andrulonis v. *United States*, 952 F.2d 652 (2d Cir. 1991) 12
Ayala v. *United States*, 980 F.2d 1342 (10th Cir. 1992) 12
B&F Trawlers, Inc. v. *United States*, 841 F.2d 626 (5th Cir. 1988) 2
Baldassaro v. *United States*, 64 F.3d 206 (5th Cir. 1995), cert. denied, 517 U.S. 1207 (1996) 2
Bearce v. *United States*, 614 F.2d 556 (7th Cir.), cert. denied, 449 U.S. 837 (1980) 2
Berkovitz v. *United States*, 486 U.S. 531 (1988) 3, 7
Canadian Transp. Co. v. *United States*, 663 F.2d 1081 (D.C. Cir. 1980) 2
Cestonaro v. *United States*, 211 F.3d 749 (3d Cir. 2000) 13
Chotin Transp., Inc. v. *United States*, 819 F.2d 1342 (6th Cir.), cert. denied, 484 U.S. 953 (1987) 2
Cope v. *Scott*, 45 F.3d 445 (D.C. Cir. 1995) 10, 12, 13
Earles v. *United States*, 935 F.2d 1028 (9th Cir. 1991) 2

Cases—Continued: Page

Gercey v. *United States*, 540 F.2d 536 (1st Cir. 1976), cert. denied, 430 U.S. 954 (1977) 2
Graves v. *United States*, 872 F.2d 133 (6th Cir. 1989) 2
Harrell v. *United States*, 443 F.3d 1231 (10th Cir. 2006) 9
Hurd v. *United States*, 34 Fed. Appx. 77 (4th Cir. 2003) 13
Indian Towing Co. v. *United States*, 350 U.S. 61 (1955) 14
Joint E.&S. Dists. Asbestos Litig., In re, 891 F.2d 31 (2d Cir. 1989) 2
Loughlin v. *United States*, 393 F.3d 155 (D.C. Cir. 2004) 14
McMellon v. *United States*, 387 F.3d 329 (4th Cir. 2004), cert. denied, 544 U.S. 974 (2005) 2
Mid-South Holding Co. v. *United States*, 225 F.3d 1201 (11th Cir. 2000) 2
Myers v. *United States*, 17 F.3d 890 (6th Cir. 1994) 12
Sea-Land Serv., Inc. v. *United States*, 919 F.2d 888 (3d Cir. 1990), cert. denied, 500 U.S. 941 (1991) 2
Shansky v. *United States*, 164 F.3d 688 (1st Cir. 1999) .. 12
Sloan v. *Department of Hous. & Urban Dev.*, 236 F.3d 756 (D.C. Cir. 2001) 9
Soldano v. *United States*, 453 F.3d 1140 (9th Cir. 2006) 14
Tew v. *United States*, 86 F.3d 1003 (10th Cir. 1996) 2
Thames Shipyard & Repair Co. v. *United States*, 350 F.3d 247 (1st Cir. 2003) 2
Theriot v. *United States*, 245 F.3d 388 (5th Cir. 1998) 9

Cases—Continued: Page

United States Fire Ins. Co. v. *United States*, 806 F.2d 1529 (11th Cir. 1986) 2
United States v. *Gaubert*, 499 U.S. 315 (1991) ..... *passim*
United States v. *S.A. Empresa de Viamao Rio Grandense (Varia Airlines)*, 467 U.S. 797 (1984) .. 4, 11
Whisnant v. *United States*, 400 F.3d 1177 (9th Cir. 2005) 11, 12
Wiggins v. *United States*, 799 F.2d 962 (5th Cir. 1986) ... 2

Statutes and regulations:

Act of Oct. 6, 2006, Pub. L. No. 109-304, § 6, 120 Stat. 1509 2
Federal Torts Claims Act, 28 U.S.C. 2680(a) 2, 3, 7
Public Vessels Act, 46 U.S.C. 31101 *et seq.* 2
46 U.S.C. 31102 2
Rivers and Harbors Appropriation Act of 1899, 33 U.S.C. 409 6
Suits in Admiralty Act, 46 U.S.C. 30901 *et seq.* 1
46 U.S.C. 30903 2
14 U.S.C. 81 8
14 U.S.C. 81(1) 9
14 U.S.C. 86 ..... 6, 8, 9
33 C.F.R.:
Section 62.1(c) 9
Section 62.21(d) 5
Section 62.25 10
Section 62.25(b)(2) 5

Regulation—Continued: Page

Section 64.33(a) 6, 8
Section 64.33(a) 8

Miscellaneous:

U.S. Coast Guard, *Aids to Navigation Manual—Administration* (1981) 6

In the Supreme Court of the United States

No. 06-1282

EDDIE TYRONE CRANFORD, ET AL., PETITIONERS

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

BRIEF FOR THE UNITED STATES IN OPPOSITION

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the court of appeals (Pet. App. 1-12) is reported at 466 F.3d 955. The opinion of the district court (Pet. App. 13-27) is unreported.

JURISDICTION

The judgment of the court of appeals was entered on October 5, 2006. A petition for rehearing was denied on December 21, 2006 (Pet. App. 28-29). The petition for a writ of certiorari was filed on March 20, 2007. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. 1254(1).

STATEMENT

1. a. The Suits in Admiralty Act (SAA), 46 U.S.C. 30901 *et seq.*, waives the federal government's sovereign immunity from maritime tort actions that do not involve

public vessels. See 46 U.S.C. 30903. The Public Vessels Act (PVA), 46 U.S.C. 31101 *et seq.*, similarly waives the federal government's sovereign immunity from admiralty claims involving public vessels. See 46 U.S.C. 31102.[1] Both waivers of sovereign immunity, however, are subject to an exception for acts involving discretionary functions, along the lines of the discretionary function exception to the Federal Tort Claims Act (FTCA), 28 U.S.C. 2680(a). See, *e.g.*, *Mid-South Holding Co.* v. *United States*, 225 F.3d 1201, 1204 (11th Cir. 2000); *United States Fire Ins. Co.* v. *United States*, 806 F.2d 1529, 1534-1535 (11th Cir. 1986).[2] The discretionary

---

[1] On October 6, 2006, the SAA and PVA were recodified with minor modifications not relevant to this case. See Act of Oct. 6, 2006, Pub. L. No. 109-304, § 6, 120 Stat. 1509.

[2] In addition to the court below, ten other courts of appeals also have held that cases brought under the SAA are subject to an implied discretionary function exception. See *Canadian Transp. Co.* v. *United States*, 663 F.2d 1081, 1085-1086 (D.C. Cir. 1980); *Gercey* v. *United States*, 540 F.2d 536, 539 (1st Cir. 1976), cert. denied, 430 U.S. 954 (1977); *In re Joint E.&S. Dists. Asbestos Litig.*, 891 F.2d 31, 35 (2d Cir. 1989); *Sea-Land Serv., Inc.* v. *United States*, 919 F.2d 888, 891 (3d Cir. 1990), cert. denied, 500 U.S. 941 (1991); *McMellon* v. *United States*, 387 F.3d 329, 349 (4th Cir. 2004), cert. denied, 544 U.S. 974 (2005); *Wiggins* v. *United States*, 799 F.2d 962, 966 (5th Cir. 1986); *Baldassaro* v. *United States*, 64 F.3d 206, 208 (5th Cir. 1995), cert. denied, 517 U.S. 1207 (1996); *Graves* v. *United States*, 872 F.2d 133, 137 (6th Cir. 1989) (citing *Chotin Transp., Inc.* v. *United States*, 819 F.2d 1342, 1347 (6th Cir.) (en banc), cert. denied, 484 U.S. 953 (1987)); *Bearce* v. *United States*, 614 F.2d 556, 559-560 (7th Cir.), cert. denied, 449 U.S. 837 (1980); *Earles* v. *United States*, 935 F.2d 1028, 1031-1032 (9th Cir. 1991); *Tew* v. *United States*, 86 F.3d 1003, 1005 (10th Cir. 1996). Two other courts of appeals have held that the discretionary function exception applies to the PVA. See *Thames Shipyard & Repair Co.* v. *United States*, 350 F.3d 247, 254 (1st Cir. 2003); *B&F Trawlers, Inc.* v. *United States*, 841 F.2d 626, 630 (5th Cir. 1988).

function exception to the FTCA provides, in relevant part, that the government retains immunity from suits "based upon the exercise or performance or the failure to exercise or perform a discretionary function or duty on the part of a federal agency or an employee of the Government, whether or not the discretion involved be abused." 28 U.S.C. 2680(a).

A two-part inquiry guides courts' application of the discretionary function exception. See *United States* v. *Gaubert*, 499 U.S. 315, 322-323 (1991). A court must first examine the alleged tortious act to determine whether it was "discretionary in nature"—that is, whether it involved "an element of judgment or choice." *Id.* at 322 (quoting *Berkovitz* v. *United States*, 486 U.S. 531, 536 (1988)). That element of judgment or choice is not involved where an employee disobeys a "federal statute, regulation, or policy" that "'specifically prescribes a course of action for [the] employee to follow,' because 'the employee has no rightful option but to adhere to the directive.'" *Ibid.* (quoting *Berkovitz*, 486 U.S. at 536); see *id.* at 324 ("If the employee violates [a] mandatory regulation, there will be no shelter from liability because there is no room for choice and the action will be contrary to policy.").

If it is determined that "the challenged conduct involves an element of judgment," *Berkovitz*, 486 U.S. at 536, the discretionary function exception applies so long as the judgment was "of the kind that the discretionary function exception was designed to shield," *Gaubert*, 499 U.S. at 322-323 (quoting *Berkovitz*, 486 U.S. at 536). And the exception is designed to shield judgments involving policy; stated differently, it is intended to "prevent judicial 'second-guessing' of legislative and administrative decisions grounded in social, economic, and

political policy through the medium of an action in tort." *Id.* at 323 (quoting *United States* v. *S.A. Empresa de Viacao Aerea Rio Grandense (Varig Airlines)*, 467 U.S. 797, 814 (1984)). "When established governmental policy, as expressed or implied by statute, regulation, or agency guidelines," allows a government employee "to exercise discretion, it must be presumed" that the employee's actions are "grounded in policy when exercising that discretion." *Id.* at 324.

In this second stage of the analysis, "[t]he focus of the inquiry is not on the agent's subjective intent in exercising the discretion conferred by statute or regulation, but on the nature of the actions taken and on whether they are *susceptible* to policy analysis." *Gaubert*, 499 U.S. at 325 (emphasis added). Further, the discretionary function exception protects discretionary decisions of government employees whether at the "policy or planning level" or the "operational" level. *Ibid.*

2. On August 9, 2003, a motor boat carrying Eddie Cranford, Ronald Melech, and Howard Melech struck a submerged vessel in Mobile Bay, near Fort Morgan beach in Alabama. Pet. App. 2, 16-17. Eddie Cranford and Howard Melech were injured in the allision with the submerged wreck (Fort Morgan wreck), and Ronald Melech died. *Id.* at 2, 17.

The Fort Morgan wreck is charted as a dangerous wreck on National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration charts. Gov't C.A. Br. 4-5; 04-0561-CB-M Docket entry No. 23, Attchs. 7-9 (S.D. Ala. June 7, 2005). The Fort Morgan wreck was first marked by the Coast Guard in 1992 with a temporary lighted buoy. Pet. App. 3. In 1996, the Coast Guard replaced the temporary buoy with a "telephone-pole-type piling" placed approximately 164 feet north-northwest of the portion of the

wreck closest to the surface. *Id.* at 3, 17. The piling was marked with two unlighted orange and white signs that bore the words "Danger Wreck." *Id.* at 3, 18.

On August 5, 2003, four days before the accident in question, the Coast Guard again modified the marker to improve the identification of the Fort Morgan wreck. It replaced the unlighted signs on the piling with a flashing red light and a six-foot-wide red triangle marked with the letters "WR2." Pet. App. 3, 17-18. One of the reasons for the change in the markings was to provide a "'lateral' aid" that would inform the mariner on which side the hazard lay. Gov't C.A. Br. 6. The red triangle indicated that the mariner should leave the mark to his right (starboard) upon returning from the Gulf of Mexico, following the "red right returning" rule. *Ibid.*; see 33 C.F.R. 62.25(b)(2), 62.21(d). The Coast Guard considered moving the piling, but declined to do so. It feared that moving the piling closer would encourage passing vessels, including the ferry from Dauphin Island, to run too close to the wreck. Gov't C.A. Br. 6; 04-0561-CB-M Docket entry No. 23, Attch. 6, at 3-4 (S.D. Ala. June 7, 2005).

3. Petitioners filed suit against the government under the SAA and the PVA, alleging that the Coast Guard acted negligently in marking the Fort Morgan wreck and in failing to remove the wreck. Pet. App. 3. The district court dismissed the claims on the ground that the conduct challenged by petitioners involves discretionary governmental functions over which the United States has not waived its sovereign immunity. *Id.* at 18-27.

4. The court of appeals affirmed. Pet. App. 1-12. Following the analysis in *Gaubert*, *supra*, the court first concluded that the Coast Guard's decisions concerning

how to mark the wreck "involved elements of judgment or choice" and therefore satisfied the first part of the discretionary function inquiry. *Id.* at 8. The court noted that the Coast Guard's statutory authority, regulations, and internal guidance all conferred broad discretion to mark wrecks as it saw fit. *Ibid.* (citing 14 U.S.C. 86; 33 C.F.R. 64.33(a); U.S. Coast Guard, *Aids to Navigation Manual—Administration* (1981) (*ATON Manual*)).

The court next held that the Coast Guard's decisions concerning whether or how to mark a submerged wreck satisfied the second part of the discretionary function analysis, because they were "susceptible to policy analysis" and "grounded in the policy of the regulatory regime." Pet. App. 9 (quoting *Gaubert*, 499 U.S. at 325). The court stated that "decisions in marking a wreck involve social, political, and economic policy considerations, such as taking into account the knowledge and customs of international mariners, balancing the needs of pleasure and commercial watercraft, and evaluating agency resource constraints, which include but are not limited to financial concerns." *Ibid.* The court rejected petitioners' argument that marking a wreck involved "merely the application of professional standards," *ibid*, noting that the decision was unlike "certain decisions resting on mathematical calculations, for example, [that] involve no choice or judgment in carrying out the calculations." *Ibid.* (quoting *Gaubert*, 499 U.S. at 331.[3]

---

[3] The court of appeals further held that the government's failure to remove the wreck likewise was protected by the discretionary function exception. It concluded that a provision of the Rivers and Harbors Appropriation Act of 1899 invoked by plaintiffs, 33 U.S.C. 409, did not require removal by the government of the wreck in question. Pet. App. 11-12. In the absence of a statute requiring the wreck's removal, the court found that the determination whether or not to remove it was

ARGUMENT

The judgment of the court of appeals is correct and does not conflict with any decision of this Court or other courts of appeals. The court of appeals correctly applied established law articulated by this Court; its fact-bound conclusion does not warrant further review.

1. The court of appeals correctly concluded that petitioners' claim against the Coast Guard for "negligently failing to adequately mark, warn of and/or guard against a known underwater hazard and an obstruction to navigation," 04-0561-CB-M Docket entry No. 1, at 1-2 (S.D. Ala. Aug. 25, 2004), falls within the scope of the discretionary function exception. 28 U.S.C. 2680(a).

a. Petitioners do not appear to challenge the court of appeals' conclusion that no "federal statute, regulation, or policy specifically prescribes a course of action" for the Coast Guard to follow with respect to marking wrecks. *Berkovitz* v. *United States*, 486 U.S. 531, 536 (1988). The Coast Guard's actions in that regard are "discretionary act[s] * * * that involve[] choice or judgment." *United States* v. *Gaubert*, 499 U.S. 315, 325 (1991).

Congress expressly granted the Coast Guard (through the Secretary of Homeland Security) broad discretion to determine when and how to mark submerged vessels and other obstructions. The relevant statute provides: "The Secretary *may* mark for the protection of navigation any sunken vessel or other obstruction existing on the navigable waters or waters above the continental shelf of the United States *in such man-*

---

discretionary and implicated public policy concerns. *Id.* at 12. Petitioners do not appear to seek review of that aspect of the court of appeals' decision.

ner and for so long as, in his judgment, the needs of maritime navigation require." 14 U.S.C. 86 (emphasis added). See 14 U.S.C. 81 (stating that Coast Guard "*may* establish, maintain, and operate * * * aids to maritime navigation *required to serve the needs of the armed forces or of the commerce of the United States*") (emphasis added). Similarly, under its own regulations, the Coast Guard "*may* mark for the protection of maritime navigation any structure, sunken vessel or other obstruction that is not suitably marked by the owner." 33 C.F.R. 64.33(a) (emphasis added).[4]

b. Petitioners' challenge to the court of appeals' application of the second part of the discretionary function analysis—whether the determinations at issue are "susceptible to policy analysis," or "grounded in the policy of the regulatory regime," *Gaubert*, 499 U.S. at 325—is without foundation.

"When established governmental policy, as expressed or implied by statute, regulation, or agency guidelines, allows a Government agent to exercise discretion, it must be presumed that the agent's acts are grounded in policy when exercising that discretion." *Gaubert*, 499 U.S. at 324. In this case, the governing statutes and reg-

---

[4] The *ATON Manual* sets forth more particular guidance for marking wrecks. See No. 04-0561-CB-M Docket entry No. 30, Exh. 18 (S.D. Ala. July 12, 2005). As the court of appeals emphasized, however, the Manual expressly provides that "the Coast Guard retains the discretion to deviate or authorize deviation from" the Manual's requirements. Pet. App. 8 (quoting *ATON Manual* 1-1). In any event, as the district court recognized, *id.* at 23, the Coast Guard complied with the relevant specifications. Thus, even if they could be described as mandatory directives, the provisions of the Manual do not support a claim against the United States. See *Gaubert*, 499 U.S. at 324 ("[I]f a regulation mandates particular conduct, and the employee obeys the direction, the Government will be protected.").

ulations expressly set forth the policies that the Coast Guard considers when deciding whether or how to mark a wreck or otherwise establish an aid to maritime navigation. See *Sloan* v. *United States Dep't Hous. & Urban Dev.*, 236 F.3d 756, 761 (D.C. Cir. 2001) (noting that "it is hardly necessary to rely on * * * a presumption" that choice is policy-based when the relevant "regulations place public policy at the forefront of the decision").[5] The Coast Guard may mark wrecks "in such manner and for so long as, in [its] judgment, *the needs of maritime navigation require*." 14 U.S.C. 86 (emphasis added). Aids to maritime navigation generally should be maintained in view of "the needs of the armed forces or of the commerce of the United States." 14 U.S.C. 81(1). And "[t]he aids to navigation system is not intended to identify every * * * obstruction to navigation * * * , but rather provides for reasonable marking of marine features as resources permit." 33 C.F.R. 62.1(c).

The Coast Guard's decision to mark a vessel in a particular manner takes account of "the degree of danger an object poses, the vessel traffic type and density, the location of the object in relation to the navigable channel, the history of vessel accidents, and the feasibility and economics, including costs, of erecting and maintaining physical markers in light of the available resources." *Theriot* v. *United States*, 245 F.3d 388, 399-400 (5th Cir. 1998). It is plainly "grounded in public policy considerations." *Id.* at 400; see *Harrell* v. *United States*, 443 F.3d 1231, 1236 (10th Cir. 2006) (holding that "the Coast

---

[5] Petitioners' argument (Pet. 15) that the court of appeals "has made that presumption irrebuttable" is therefore beside the point because the presumption need not be invoked in this case.

Guard's decisions concerning whether and when to service [a] buoy * * * were policy-based").

Petitioners argue (Pet. 6-7) that the decisionmakers here did not, in fact, consider matters of policy in marking the wreck. That argument bears little weight because "[t]he focus of the inquiry is not on the agent's subjective intent in exercising the discretion conferred by statute or regulation, but on the nature of the actions taken and on whether they are susceptible to policy analysis." *Gaubert*, 499 U.S. at 325. To the extent, however, that "[e]vidence of the actual decision may be helpful in understanding whether the 'nature' of the decision implicated policy judgments," *Cope* v. *Scott*, 45 F.3d 445, 449 (D.C. Cir. 1995), that evidence supports the Coast Guard.

The record makes clear that Coast Guard officers weighed policy considerations in determining to modify the wreck marker in 2003, and in deciding what form that modification should take. The beacon marking the Fort Morgan wreck was changed on August 5, 2003, "in order to better mark the wreck following a report of a vessel striking the wreck in 2002." 04-0561-CB-M Docket entry No. 23, Attch. 6, at 3 (S.D. Ala. June 7, 2005). The commanding officer determined that because the Fort Morgan wreck was not near a commercially navigable channel, "it wasn't that much of a hazard to navigation." *Id.* No. 23, Attch. 15, at 26. He recommended in favor of changing the signage on the wreck marker to add a flashing light and provide a lateral aid, in accordance with Coast Guard policies. *Id.* No. 23, Attch. 15, at 70, 78; see 33 C.F.R. 62.25. He did not, however, recommend adding a second marker to the Fort Morgan wreck, because he did not "want to establish a preceden[t] where the Coast Guard was * * *

going to place an inordinate amount of aids to navigation on wrecks * * * whose hazard was questionable." 04-0561-CB-M Docket entry No. 23, Attch. 15, at 71 (June 7, 2005); see *United States* v. *S.A. Empresa de Viacao Aerea Rio Grandense (Varig Airlines)*, 467 U.S. 797, 820 (1984) (discretionary function exception applies to decisions that "require the agency to establish priorities for the accomplishment of its policy objectives by balancing the objectives sought to be obtained against such practical considerations as staffing and funding"). The Coast Guard decided not to move the marker out of a concern that if placed any closer to the wreck, the marker risked drawing the Fort Morgan ferry dangerously close to the wreck. 04-0561-CB-M Docket entry No. 23, Attch. 6, at 3-4 (S.D. Ala. June 7, 2005); *id.* No. 23, Attch. 13, at 24, 41-43. Such judgments, based upon balancing concerns for the safety of the local passenger ferry with the needs of smaller vessels traversing the area, clearly are policy-based.

2. As the above discussion indicates, the question whether the discretionary function exception applies to a particular case is highly fact-specific and depends on the particulars of the statutory and regulatory scheme and the decision at issue. None of this Court's decisions or the decisions of other courts of appeals that petitioners cite creates a conflict with the Eleventh Circuit's fact-specific judgment in this case.

Contrary to petitioners' argument (Pet. 13 n.2, 24-25), there is no general limitation upon the discretionary function exception for matters of safety. Several of the cases that petitioners cite acknowledge this explicitly. *E.g.*, *Whisnant* v. *United States*, 400 F.3d, 1177, 1182 n.3 (9th Cir. 2005) (no liability when, *e.g.*, "government officials must consider competing fire-fighter safety and

public safety considerations in deciding how to fight a forest fire, * * * [or] balance prison safety and inmate privacy considerations in deciding how to search a prisoner's cell in response to a reported threat of violence"); *Shansky* v. *United States*, 164 F.3d 688, 693 (1st Cir. 1999) ("[T]here is no principled basis for superimposing a generalized 'safety exception' upon the discretionary function defense."); *Ayala* v. *United States*, 980 F.2d 1342, 1350 n.4 (10th Cir. 1992) (noting that safety standards "are themselves policy judgments concerning trade-offs between safety, effectiveness, and economy"). That is so because "safety" is often one competing policy consideration that an agency must weigh alongside others or is a more complicated risk-benefit calculation that involves the competing interests of multiple parties.

In those cases in which a court has found the discretionary function exception inapplicable to a safety-related decision, the court also has found that there was effectively no countervailing policy interest that could justify a failure properly or adequately to take the safety measure. See *Whisnant*, 400 F.3d at 1184 (finding that decision not to remove mold from Navy commissary did not involve "allocation of limited resources among competing safety-promoting tasks") (emphasis omitted); *Cope*, 45 F.3d at 451-452 (holding aesthetics not to be countervailing policy consideration when "Park Service has chosen to manage the road in a manner more amenable to commuting through nature than communing with it"); *Myers* v. *United States*, 17 F.3d 890, 897-898 (6th Cir. 1994) (finding no balancing of policy choices implicated by claim that MSHA inspectors "should have found, but failed to find, the existence of certain safety violations") (emphasis omitted); *Andrulonis* v. *United States*, 952 F.2d 652, 655 (2d Cir. 1991)

(finding "neither a regulatory framework nor a defined policy that could serve as the basis for infusing all decisions of CDC employees with policy implications"); *Cestonaro* v. *United States*, 211 F.3d 749, 755-756 (3d Cir. 2000) (concluding that government could articulate no policy rationale for adding some safety measures but not others).[6] In this case, by contrast, the competing policies at issue are indicated on the face of the relevant statutes and regulations. See pp. 10-11, *supra*.

It is certainly relevant whether the government decision reflects the application of "technical safety assessments" or "objective professional standards." Pet. 8; see, *e.g.*, *Berkovitz*, 486 U.S. at 544-545; *Ayala*, 980 F.2d at 1349 (finding mine safety inspector's "technical assistance" concerning "where to connect * * * lights" on automatic mining machine "was governed solely by technical considerations"). Petitioners' assertion (Pet. 8-9) that the presence or absence of such considerations controls the analysis, however, is incorrect. In petitioners' view, decisions about maritime safety warnings would never be discretionary because they would always turn on the mere application of technical judgment. But in other failure-to-warn cases, the courts of appeals have not adopted that categorical approach, and have instead employed a case-by-case approach under which the results vary, even within the same circuit, depending on the particular circumstances of each case. Compare, *e.g.*, *Cope*, 45 F.3d at 451-452 (finding that where 23 traffic warning signs were already posted, failure to warn of slippery road conditions was not policy-based), with

---

[6] In *Hurd* v. *United States*, 34 Fed. Appx. 77, 81-85 (4th Cir. 2002), the court of appeals declined to address the applicability of the discretionary function exception even though the district court did so. *Hurd* therefore does not create or deepen a circuit split. See Pet. 22.

Loughlin v. *United States*, 393 F.3d 155, 165-166 (D.C. Cir. 2004) (finding that failure to warn about buried munitions and chemicals required balancing, *inter alia*, safety and national security concerns). See generally *Soldano* v. *United States*, 453 F.3d 1140, 1146-1147 (9th Cir. 2006) (describing varied holdings in Ninth Circuit failure-to-warn cases). Like those courts, the court of appeals in this case eschewed a categorical approach and made a fact-specific determination about the nature of the policy decision whether and how to mark a maritime obstruction. In so doing, the court did not create any conflict among the circuits, and its fact-bound conclusion does not warrant further review.[7]

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be denied.

Respectfully submitted.

PAUL D. CLEMENT
Solicitor General

PETER D. KEISLER
Assistant Attorney General

ROBERT S. GREENSPAN
DANA J. MARTIN
Attorneys

JULY 2007

---

[7] Petitioners also argue (Pet. 14-15) that the decision in this case conflicts with *Indian Towing Co.* v. *United States*, 350 U.S. 61 (1955). *Indian Towing* did not, however, address the scope of the discretionary function exception. *Id.* at 64; see *Gaubert*, 499 U.S. at 326. In any event, the alleged negligence at issue in that case—failure to ensure that a lighthouse was operating properly—differs significantly from the policy-laden judgments concerning maritime markers in this case.

(3)

No. 06-1282

FILED
AUG 2 2 2007
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

In The
Supreme Court of the United States

EDDIE TYRONE CRANFORD,
HOWARD MELECH, and DIANE G. MELECH,

Petitioners,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent.

On Petition For Writ Of Certiorari
To The United States Court Of Appeals
For The Eleventh Circuit

REPLY TO BRIEF IN OPPOSITION

DAVID G. WIRTES, JR.
Counsel of Record
JOHN T. CROWDER, JR.
GREGORY B. BREEDLOVE
RICHARD EDWIN LAMBERTH
GEORGE M. DENT, III
CUNNINGHAM, BOUNDS, CROWDER,
BROWN AND BREEDLOVE, L.L.C.
1601 Dauphin Street
P. O. Box 66705
Mobile, Alabama 36660
(251) 471-6191
(251) 479-1031 (Facsimile)

Counsel for Petitioners

COCKLE LAW BRIEF PRINTING CO. (800) 225-6964
OR CALL COLLECT (402) 342-2831

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
REPLY TO BRIEF IN OPPOSITION	1
CONCLUSION	10

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

CASES

Andrulonis v. United States, 952 F.2d 652 (2d Cir. 1991), *cert. den.*, 505 U.S. 1204 (1992) 1, 8

Berkovitz v. United States, 486 U.S. 531 (1998)..... 1, 2

Cestonaro v. United States, 211 F.3d 749 (3d Cir. 2000)..... 1, 8

Cope v. Scott, 45 F.3d 445 (D.C. Cir. 1995).....2, 3, 8

Harrell v. United States, 443 F.3d 1231 (10th Cir. 2006).....2, 3, 4, 7

Hurd v. United States, 134 F.Supp.2d 745 (D.S.C. 2001), *aff'd*, 34 Fed.Appx.77 (4th Cir. 2002)..... 1

Indian Towing Co. v. United States, 350 U.S. 61 (1955)..... 9

Myers v. United States, 17 F.3d 890 (6th Cir. 1994)..... 1, 8

Skansky v. United States, 164 F.3d 688 (1st Cir. 1999)..... 1, 2

Sloan v. United States Dept. of Housing and Urban Dev., 236 F.3d 756 (D.C. Cir. 2001)..... 4, 7

Theriot v. United States, 245 F.3d 388 (5th Cir. 1998).....3, 4, 7

TSC Industries, Inc. v. Northway, Inc., 426 U.S. 438 (1975)..... 1

United States v. Ayala, 980 F.2d 1342 (10th Cir. 1992)..... 2

United States v. Gaubert, 499 U.S. 315 (1991).....*passim*

Whisnant v. United States, 400 F.3d 1177 (9th Cir. 2005)..... 1, 8

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

Page

STATUTES

Federal Tort Claims Act ("FTCA"), 28 U.S.C. § 2680 3

Public Vessels Act ("PVA"), 46 U.S.C. § 31101 3

Suits in Admiralty Act ("SAA"), 46 U.S.C. § 30901 *et seq.* 3

REPLY TO BRIEF IN OPPOSITION

The paucity of the response by the United States proves the merit of the Petition. To the argument that circuits other than the Eleventh have developed workable, meaningful tests for applying the second prong of the test set forth in *United States v. Gaubert*, 499 U.S. 315 (1991), the United States can say only that each case involves "a fact-specific determination," Br. p. 14, so there can be no conflict. It is no answer to say summarily that cases do not conflict because their facts are different. The question is what law the courts apply to the facts. As fully set forth in the Petition, the Courts of Appeals for the First, Second, Third, Fourth, Sixth, Ninth, Tenth, and District of Columbia Circuits have articulated standards – such as whether "technical safety assessments,"[1] "objective criteria,"[2] or "professional, scientific, or engineering standards,"[3]

---

[1] *Shansky v. United States*, 164 F.3d 688, 693 (1st Cir. 1999) (discussing the "line of cases involving . . . technical safety assessments"); *Andrulonis v. United States*, 952 F.2d 652, 655 (2d Cir. 1991), *cert. den.*, 505 U.S. 1204 (1992) (no policy "required, or even encouraged, Dr. Baer to ignore unsafe . . . conditions and thereby unnecessarily place . . . lives . . . at risk"); *Cestonaro v. United States*, 211 F.3d 749, 759 (3d Cir. 2000) ("We are unable to find a rational nexus between the National Park Services' lighting or warning decisions (or non-decisions) and social, economic and political concerns"); *Myers v. United States*, 17 F.3d 890, 897 (6th Cir. 1994) (mine safety "assessments . . . informed by professional judgment and knowledge").

[2] *Hurd v. United States*, 134 F.Supp.2d 745, 769 (D.S.C. 2001) ("objective criteria"), *aff'd*, 34 Fed.Appx.77 (4th Cir. 2002); *Myers*, 17 F.3d 890 at 897. It is no answer to say that the federal actor has the final word on the result of applying "objective criteria," because the classic jury question is what a "reasonable man" would have done. "[T]he jury's unique competence in applying the 'reasonable man' standard is thought ordinarily to preclude summary judgment in negligence cases." *TSC Industries, Inc. v. Northway, Inc.*, 426 U.S. 438, 450, n. 12 (1975).

[3] *Berkovitz v. United States*, 486 U.S. 531, 545 (1998) ("objective scientific standards"); *Whisnant v. United States*, 400 F.3d 1177, 1181 (9th Cir. 2005) ("matters of scientific and professional judgment – particularly

(Continued on following page)

Petition, *passim*, are involved – for determining whether "actions and decisions [are] based on considerations of public policy." *Gaubert*, 499 U.S. at 323. In contrast, and in conflict, the Eleventh Circuit, like the United States in its Brief, simply concludes, *ipse dixit* and without meaningful analysis, that all decisions and choices by federal actors are grounded in public policy.

The United States wrongly accuses the Plaintiffs of seeking "a general limitation upon the discretionary function exception for matters of safety," Br. pp. 11-12, blatantly ignoring this sentence introducing Plaintiffs' survey of other jurisdictions:

> Other circuits, while carefully refraining from adopting a blanket "safety" exclusion from the discretionary function exception, have developed tests to determine whether safety-related decisions truly involve policy-making or -executing discretion, or only involve the application of "objective criteria," "technical safety assessments," or "scientific, professional, or engineering standards."

Petition p. 16. If a federal employee has to balance "incommensurable values such as safety and aesthetics," *Shansky*, 164 F.3d at 693, that is a policy decision. If a federal employee has to weigh competing demands to make "decisions concerning *whether and when*" to place or maintain a safety device, *Harrell v. United States*, 443 F.3d 1231, 1236 (10th Cir. 2006) (emphasis added), cited at U.S. Br. p. 9, that may well be a policy-based decision, because not all dangers can be marked, and all the ones that need marking cannot be marked simultaneously.

---

judgments concerning safety"); *United States v. Ayala*, 980 F.2d 1342, 1349-50 (10th Cir. 1992) ("The choice was governed . . . by 'objective principles of electrical engineering' "); *Cope v. Scott*, 45 F.3d 445, 452 (D.C. Cir. 1995) ("The 'engineering judgment' the government relies on is no more a matter of policy than were the 'objective scientific principles' that the *Berkovitz* Court distinguished from exempt exercises of policy judgment.").

However, if a federal employee is simply deciding whether one choice or another among available options best promotes safety, that cannot be a "discretionary function" without writing the FTCA, the SAA, and the PVA[4] out of existence, because such a decision involves little, if anything, more than due care, and the absence of due care is the very thing for which Congress has made the United States liable. To paraphrase the *Cope* court, the Coast Guard "has understandably been unable to articulate how the placement of additional or different signs on [or near the Fort Morgan wreck] implicates the type of economic, social, or political concerns that the discretionary function exception protects from suit." 45 F.3d at 452. Instead, "the focus of the inquiry is . . . on the nature of the actions t and on whether they are susceptible to policy analys *United States v. Gaubert*, 499 U.S. 315, 325 (1991).

The United States cites only two cases as supposedly holding that the *manner* of marking a wrecked vessel for safety is a policy-based decision, and it misstates those cases:

> The Coast Guard's decision to mark a vessel in a particular manner takes account of "the degree of danger an object poses, the vessel traffic type and density, the location of the object in relation to the navigable channel, the history of vessel accidents, and the feasibility and economics, including costs, of erecting and maintaining physical markers in light of the available resources." *Theriot v. United States*, 245 F.3d 388, 399-400 (5th Cir. 1998). It is plainly "grounded in public policy considerations." *Id.* at 400; see *Harrell v. United States*, 443 F.3d 1231, 1236 (10th Cir. 2006) (holding that "the Coast Guard's decision concerning whether and when to service [a] buoy * * * were policy-based").

---

[4] Federal Tort Claims Act ("FTCA"), 28 U.S.C. § 2680; Suits in Admiralty Act ("SAA"), 46 U.S.C. § 30901 *et seq.*; Public Vessels Act ("PVA"), 46 U.S.C. § 31101

Br. pp. 9-10. Like *Harrell*, quoted above, *Theriot* concerns only the "whether and when," *not* the "manner" of warning against dangers: "In determining *when and whether* to mark a public work such as the sill in question, the United States considers, among other things: the degree of danger an object poses, [and the rest of the list quoted by the United States]." 245 F.3d at 399 (emphasis added). The only other case that the United States cites in this portion of its brief is *Sloan v. United States Dept. of Housing and Urban Dev.*, 236 F.3d 756 (D.C. Cir. 2001), Br. p. 9, but *Sloan* involved prosecutorial discretion, not a technical safety assessment: "The decision to initiate a prosecution has long been regarded as a classic discretionary function." 236 F.3d at 760. Thus, the United States has not cited a single case holding that the *manner* of providing for safety is a discretionary function.

The United States asserts that

> The record makes *clear* that Coast Guard officers weighed policy considerations in determining to modify the wreck marker in 2003, and then deciding what form that modification should take. . . . Such judgments, based upon balancing concerns for the safety of the local passenger ferry with the needs of smaller vessels traversing the area, *clearly* are policy-based.

Br. pp. 10-11 (emphasis added). Aside from resting their weight on the word "clear," which signals *ipse dixit* and a lack of empirical or logical support, these assertions suffer from at least three problems: First, the United States' own articulation of the alleged policies at issue demonstrates that the Coast Guard balanced only safety considerations, not "incommensurable values." Second, they favor the summary-judgment movant's evidence over the evidence of the non-movant, accepting the Coast Guard's unsubstantiated assertion, *see* Br. p. 5, that safety for the Dauphin Island Ferry (which makes the same passage several times a day, and whose pilots therefore know the waters) is somehow different from safety for recreational boaters.

Third, after accepting this counterintuitive and contradicted evidence, the United States then leaps to the unsupported conclusion that the choice of wreck marker is "clearly . . . policy-based," rather than a "technical safety assessment" based on "objective criteria." On the contrary, the evidence for the Plaintiffs is that the Coast Guard simply negligently placed the marker too far away from the wreck, thereby preventing mariners from being able to recognize and avoid the hazard; that the Coast Guard negligently placed a confusing red marker, as opposed to a more recognizable "Danger Wreck" marker closer to the wreck; that the Coast Guard's decision to use the red marker negligently enhanced the danger by making a bad situation worse, in that the red marker, unlike a "Danger Wreck" marker, actually draws boaters closer to the wreck because it appears to be a channel marker, which is what even the Alabama Marine Police thought it was; and that the Coast Guard negligently failed to place more than one marker at the wreck site. *See* Petition pp. 2-7 and Exhibits cited, especially Doc. 30, Exhibit 17. The Coast Guard's bare assertion that the ferry would be better served by the red triangle (*see, e.g.*, Doc. 30, Ex. 13) is entirely unsupported, and it makes no attempt to support any assertion that commercial vessels other than the Dauphin Island Ferry would be better served by a red triangle than by a "Danger Wreck" marker.

The supposed conflicting policies are, instead, merely Officer Marinelli's rationalizations for his bureaucratic stubbornness and refusal to pay attention to his field officers, for his decision "to cover [his] butt" by unnecessarily and irrationally insisting upon a lateral aid to navigation, "whether or not it meets our approval." Doc. 30, Exhibit 1, p. 3. Marinelli's decision was so bad that both the Coast Guard and the Alabama Marine Police, investigating this incident, referred to the wreck as an "unmarked obstruction." Doc. 30, Exhibit 7, and Exhibit 15, pp. 8-9. The policy decision to mark the Fort Morgan wreck was made long ago; Exhibit 3 to Doc. 30 shows Coast Guard marking of the wreck at least since 1992. The

United States has not yet articulated how the 2003 decision to allegedly improve that marker was "susceptible to policy analysis," *Gaubert*, 499 U.S. at 325. It is hard to see what policy was being served by the "upgraded" marker, especially where the bureaucrat's choice of marker led field officers of the *very same* federal agency to conclude that the supposedly better marked wreck was in fact "unmarked."

Nothing else in the brief of the United States does anything more than the above-refuted excerpts to help its position. Of the 33 cases cited in the United States' brief, 16 are cited only for the proposition that a discretionary function exception applies to the SAA and to the PVA. Br. p. 2 and n. 2. The United States then embarks on a bland recapitulation of this Court's holdings in *Gaubert* and earlier cases, Br. pp. 3-4, and a short, omissively inaccurate statement of the facts, Br. pp. 4-5.[5] The United States then summarizes the opinion below, Br. pp. 5-6. As can be seen on page 6, the conclusion of the Eleventh Circuit that

---

[5] The United States incorrectly states the facts favorably to itself as summary-judgment movant. With one exception, Plaintiffs will not contrast that statement with the non-movant's evidence and the Plaintiffs' statement, Petition pp. 3-7. That exception is the assertion that "The red triangle indicated that the mariner should leave the mark to his right (starboard) upon returning from the Gulf of Mexico, following the 'red right returning' rule." Br. p. 5. The marker was not near a channel, but the red triangle implied that it was. Even the Coast Guard, with the leisure of studying references, could scarcely decide whether the conventional direction of buoyage (i.e. "returning") off the north shore of Fort Morgan Peninsula was west-to-east or east-to-west. Doc. 30, Ex. 12, pp. 51-52. It was therefore readily foreseeable that a mariner or a recreational boater would conclude that the marker indicated a channel in which "returning" was westward, would thus keep this "channel marker" to starboard while traveling west (or to port while traveling east, as the Plaintiffs were), and would therefore pass it to the south (as the Plaintiffs did), where the wreck lay. *Id.*, pp. 68-69. The absence of a channel to be marked, the implication from a red triangle that a channel was being marked, and the ambiguity in the direction of buoyage are part of what made the red triangle an objectively bad choice, and there is no color of "public policy" involved in that decision. *See* Petition, pp. 3-7, and exhibits cited therein.

the manner of marking the wreck "involve[d] social, political, and economic policy considerations" is entirely conclusory, a mere "because I said so," a classic *ipse dixit*.

The argument of the United States begins on page 7 of its brief. Part 1.a., Br. pp. 7-8, seems to assert that no Coast Guard regulation specifically required a different marker and thus that the facts pass the first prong of the *Gaubert* test, a conclusion which is uncontested. Part 1.b., Br. pp. 8-11, then seems designed to show that the second prong of *Gaubert* is met. The cases the United States cites (*Sloan, Theriot*, and *Harrell*, all *supra*) are inapposite, as explained above, and the evidence it recites, Br. pp. 10-11 simply parrots the Coast Guard's rationalizations for its negligent actions without invoking "social, political, or economic policy" in any way that Plaintiffs can discern.

Part 2 of the United States' Argument, Br. pp. 11-14, then seems designed to refute the argument that other Circuits apply meaningful standards, but it does nothing of the kind. Instead, the United States retreats to the insistence that each discretionary-function issue is "highly fact-specific," Br. p. 11, and "a fact-specific determination," Br. p. 14, as though no pattern can be discerned, expected, or imposed. This is the antithesis of law. It is the advocation of anarchy. The United States, like the Eleventh Circuit, asserts that any choice by a federal actor can be justified by invoking the protean thaumaturge "policy," and no one can hold the actor accountable. If merely saying the word "policy" can miraculously end all debate and provide an arbitrarily changeable shield from liability, then reason has fled, and we have obtained a government of men, not of laws. A court accepting this position is declining to serve as a court, because it is refusing to adjudicate a dispute on reasoned grounds, and it is writing almost out of existence the Congressional acts broadly waiving sovereign immunity.

The United States says: "[I]n those cases in which the court has found the discretionary function exception inapplicable to a safety-related decision, the court also has

found that there was effectively no countervailing policy interest that could justify a failure properly or adequately to take the safety measure." Br. pp. 12-13, citing five of the cases on which Plaintiffs rely.[6] Exactly! *There is no policy other than safety at issue here.* ***There is "no countervailing policy interest that could justify [the] failure properly or adequately to take the safety measure,"*** and the United States makes no attempt to articulate one!

Finally, at pp. 13-14, the United States miscasts the Petition's argument for consideration of " 'technical safety assessments' or 'objective professional standards,' " Br. p. 13 (citations omitted), as an attempt to establish a "categorical approach" under which "decisions about maritime safety warnings would never be discretionary," *ibid.* On the contrary, Plaintiffs argue only that *Gaubert's* "presumption" should not apply to such decisions. *See, e.g.*,

> In *Gaubert*, this Court held that "When established governmental policy . . . allows a Government agent to exercise discretion, it must be *presumed* that the agent's acts are grounded in policy when exercising that discretion." 499 U.S. at 324 (emphasis added). The Eleventh Circuit has made that presumption irrebuttable.

Petition, p. 15. *See also*

> If the government could create such rationalization, it would be impossible for any victim of a federal tort to overcome the "presum[ption] that the agent's acts are grounded in policy." *Gaubert*, 499 U.S. at 324.

Petition, p. 13, n. 2. In short, no "public policy" presumption should apply to a decision facially involving only technical safety assessments or a question of objective professional judgment, but the absence of such a presumption does not preclude the United States from entitling itself to an immunity defense by offering evidence that

---

[6] *Whisnant*, *Cope*, *Myers*, *Andrulonis*, and *Cestonaro*, all *supra*.

some countervailing policy interest prevented implementing the choice that was objectively more safe. In its brief, the United States identifies no policy other than safety here, so no presumption of "public policy" should provide an absolute shield of immunity from inquiry into the Coast Guard's egregious lack of due care in assessing safety and, indeed, the holding of the Eleventh Circuit that the decision involved a discretionary function should be reversed.

It is the United States, not the Plaintiffs, that seeks a "categorical approach," under which the mere invocation of the word "policy" by the United States as a defendant precludes further inquiry, despite the broad waiver of sovereign immunity by Congress in the Federal Tort Claims Act, the SAA, and the PVA. Such a categorical approach ignores this Court's holding in *Indian Towing Co. v. United States*, 350 U.S. 61, 66 (1995), wherein this Court rejected the United States' request to immunize it from all acts done in furtherance of a governmental statute or policy, but instead found that when the Coast Guard makes a policy choice to voluntarily assume a duty, it can be held liable for failure to perform that duty within objective principles of due care.[7] This Court should not accept this invitation to repeal legislation, and it should

---

[7] Contrary to the United States' contention, Br. at 14, *Indian Towing* is relevant to issue of governmental immunity, as demonstrated by this Court's holding:

> The broad and just purpose which the statute was designed to effect was to compensate the victims of negligence in the conduct of governmental activities in circumstances like unto those in which a private person would be liable and not to leave just treatment to the caprice and legislative burden of individual private laws. Of course, when dealing with a statute subjecting the Government to liability for potentially great sums of money, this Court must not promote profligacy by careless construction. Neither should it as a self-constituted guardian of the Treasury import ***immunity*** back into a statute designed to limit it.

350 U.S. at 68-69 (emphasis added).

overturn the Eleventh Circuit's categorical refusal to enforce the Congressional waivers of sovereign immunity.

CONCLUSION

The Petition should be granted, the judgment of the Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit should be reversed, and the cause ultimately should be remanded to the District Court for the Southern District of Alabama for proceedings absent a "discretionary function" defense.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVID G. WIRTES, JR.
Counsel of Record
JOHN T. CROWDER, JR.
GREGORY B. BREEDLOVE
RICHARD EDWIN LAMBERTH
GEORGE M. DENT, III
CUNNINGHAM, BOUNDS, CROWDER, BROWN AND BREEDLOVE, L.L.C.
1601 Dauphin Street
P. O. Box 66705
Mobile, Alabama 36660
(251) 471-6191
(251) 479-1031 (Facsimile)

Counsel for Petitioners

August 22, 2007